BACON'S POEM, 'THE WORLD': ITS DATE AND RELATION TO CERTAIN OTHER POEMS.

IN the *Fortnightly Review* for September 1899 appeared an article by Miss Alice Law on a Caroline Commonplace-book in her possession, the most interesting part of which was devoted to a discussion of the authorship and date of the poem, generally attributed to Bacon, whose title stands at the head of this article. Of this poem Miss Law printed, from her Commonplace-book, what she describes as 'a rare and curiously unique copy...inasmuch as the verses here given in italics now appear in print for the first time and are not found in any of the other existing MS. copies of the poem.' Miss Law argued at considerable length for the thesis that the poem was written not by Bacon but by Sir Henry Wotton; and that its probable date is some time between 1610 and 1615. I think I am able to throw some light on the additional stanzas, to show that the traditional ascription of the poem to Bacon is probably correct, and to connect it with poems by Donne, Bastard and Wotton written in or about 1598.

The poem was first printed by the classical scholar Thomas Farnaby (a contemporary of Bacon, Donne and Wotton), in 1629, as a version by Bacon of the epigram attributed to Posidippus, beginning,

Ποίην τις βιότοιο τάμῃ τρίβον;

'Huc elegantem V. C. et Domini Verulamii παρῳδίαν adjicere adlubuit' are Farnaby's words.

This epigram and the reply to it attributed to Metrodorus (Mackail, *Select Epigrams*, 1906, pp. 299—300) are both in the Planudean Anthology; and were translated into English by Nicolas Grimald before 1557, when his versions were printed in Tottel's *Miscellany*. Grimald's paraphrases are to some extent the source of those which followed, including Bacon's, and I propose to print them; but in doing so I should like to give the opening lines of the original epigrams, as

it will be seen that in the English versions the classification of life's principal arenas underwent a gradual and characteristic alteration. 'What path of life may one hold?' runs Mackail's rendering, 'In the market-place are strifes and hard dealings, in the house cares; in the country labour enough, and at sea terror, etc.' 'Hold every path of life,' is the reply. 'In the market-place are honours and prudent dealings, in the house rest; in the country the charm of nature, and at sea gain, etc.' Grimald's renderings are as follows:

Mans life after Possidonius *or* Crates.

What path list you to tred? what trade will you assaye?
The courts of plea, by braul and bate, driue gentle peace away.
In house, for wife and childe, there is but cark and care:
With trauail, and with toyl ynough, in feelds wee vse to fare.
Vpon the seas lieth dreed: the rich in foraine land
Doo feare the losse: and there the poore like misers poorly stand.
Strife with a wife, without, your thrift full hard to see:
Yong brats a trouble: none at all, a maym it seems to bee:
Youth, fond: age hath no hert, and pincheth all to nye.
Choose then the leefer of these twoo, no life, or soon to dye.

Metrodorus *minde to the contrarie.*

What race of life ronne you? what trade will you assaye?
In courts is glory gott, and witt encreased daye by daye.
At home we take our ease, and beak our selues in rest:
The feelds our nature doo refresh with pleasures of the best.
On seas is gayn to gett: the straunger, hee shall bee
Esteemed, hauing much: if not, none knoweth his lack, but hee.
A wyfe will trim thy house: no wife? then art thou free.
Brood is a louely thing: without, thy life is loose to thee.
Yong bloods be strong: old sires in double honour dwell.
Doo waye that choys, no life or soon to dye, for all is well.

In 1589 *The Arte of English Poesie* (attributed to Richard or George Puttenham) appeared, and under the heading '*Antipophora* or Figure of responce' the author 'Englished' these epigrams again, evidently with Grimald's version in view, but in six-foot lines throughout.

It will be observed that Grimald takes

εἰν ἀγορῇ μὲν
νείκεα καὶ χαλεπαὶ πρήξιες·

as referring not to the business of the market-place, but to the law-courts, which 'by braul and bate driue gentle peace away' but where there is 'glory gott and witt encreased daye by daye.' Puttenham refers also in the first epigram to the 'brawle and brabbles of the law,' but in the second he introduces a division which was a favourite Elizabethan one—the Court, the City, and the Country. His expression 'Court gets vs

great renowne' *may* refer to the courts of law, but I think it is more likely that it refers to the Court of the King. This at any rate, it will be seen, is the classification fastened on by Bacon and the poets who took up the theme later[1].

Bacon's poem—assuming it to be his—is well known, but I should like to quote it for the sake of comparison, and because there are some important differences of reading between the two printed authorities for the text, Farnaby's volume and the *Reliquiae Wottonianae.* Miss Law's chief reason for doubting Bacon's authorship was that in the first edition (1651) of the latter work the poem was marked, like others, *Ignoto.* From this she argued, with Dr Grosart, that the copy found among Wotton's papers had been unsigned, and that either because Wotton did not know the author, or because he was himself the author. But this is a rash inference. Wotton may have known so well who was the author that he made no note of it. Collections of Donne's poems were frequently left thus nameless. Farnaby's ascription is not to be set aside lightly. He probably knew Bacon well. Moreover, in a collection preserved at Corpus Christi Coll., Oxford, of what seem to be papers that had been Wotton's (they include letters, printed from this source by Mr Pearsall Smith in his *Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton,* and poems) there is a beautifully written copy of this poem signed 'F. B.,' which is the signature it would bear before it became proper to give it the more formal signature which it bears in the later editions of the *Reliquiae Wottonianae,* 'Fra. Lord Bacon' or more correctly 'Fra. Bacon, Lord Verulam,' or as in a Trinity College, Dublin, MS. 'Visc. St Albans.' It is quite possible that in 1651 an editor would not recognise at once what 'F. B.' stood for.

Of the further contents of this MS. collection I shall have something to say presently. Meantime this is the poem as printed by Farnaby

[1] The view that the words

εἰν ἀγορῇ μὲν
νείκεα καὶ χαλεπαὶ πρήξιες

referred to the Law-courts seems to have been common in the 16th and 17th centuries. Grotius' Latin version in Firmin-Didot's edition of the Palatine Anthology opens thus:

Quod vitae sectemur iter? Fora plena molestis
Litibus:

The substitution of the King's Court for the courts of law originated apparently with Ronsard (1560). The first four lines of his version run:

Quel train de vie est-il bon que je suive
Afin, Muret, qu'heureusement je vive?
Dans les palais il n'y a que procès,
Noises, débats et querelleux excès;

but the Elzevirian edition gives as a variant of the last:

Aux cours des Roys regne l'ambition,
Les senateurs sont pleins de passion.

(taken from Spedding, for I have not Farnaby's volume at hand) with the variants of the *Reliquiae Wottonianae*, one of which I have adopted.

The World.

The World's a bubble: and the life of man
less than a span.
In his Conception wretched: from the womb
so to the Tomb:
Curst from the Cradle, and brought up to years,
with Cares and Fears.
Who then to frail Mortality shall trust
But limns on Water, or but writes in Dust.

Yet since with sorrow here we live opprest,
what life is best?
Courts are but only superficial Schools,
to dandle Fools:
The rural parts are turned into a Den
of savage Men:
And where's a City from all vice so free,
But may be term'd the worst of all the three?

Domestick Cares afflict the Husbands bed,
or pains his Head:
Those that live single, take it for a curse,
or do things worse:
These would have Children, those that have them none,
or wish them gone:
What is it then to have or have no Wife,
But single thraldom, or a double strife?

Our own Affections still at home to please
is a Disease.
To cross the Seas to any foreign soil,
peril and toil.
Wars with their noise affright us: when they cease
we 'are worse in peace.
What then remains, but that we still should cry
Not to be born, or being born to die?

l. 5. Curst *Farnaby*, Nurst *Reliq. Wott. and Corpus MS., but Latin Version* diris votus. Curst *altered to* Nurst *Trin. Coll. MS.* G. 2. 21.

l. 8. on Water] the Water *Farn.*

l. 9. since *Farn.*, whilst *Reliq. Wott.*

l. 13. parts are *Farn. and Corpus and Trin. MSS.*, part is *Reliq. Wott.*, Rura in Speluncam migrant *Lat.*

l. 15. all vice *Farn. and Corpus MS.*, foul vice *Reliq. Wott.*

l. 21. none *Farn. and Corpus and Trin. MSS.*, moan *Reliq. Wott.*

l. 32. Not...die? *Farn. and Corpus and Trin. MS.*, For being born, and being born to die? *Reliq. Wott.* The reading in the text has the support of the original, and of other imitations, as Drummond's:

Who would not one of those two offers try,—
Not to be born, or being born, to die?

and King's

At least with that Greek sage still make us cry,
Not to be born, or being born, to die.

I quote these from Hannah's note, *Poems by Raleigh, Wotton* etc. 1892. The readings of the *Reliquiae Wottonianae* seem to me very like emendations of an editor.

In Miss Law's Commonplace-book, ll. 17 f. run thus:

Some sick care overwhelmes the husbands joyes,
his mirth annoyes.

In Miss Law's version of this poem the first two stanzas are not given at all; but each of the last two is followed by what Miss Law printed as new and additional stanzas hitherto unknown. It is strange that she should not have noticed, what is evident at a glance, that these are not additional stanzas but replies, which the copyist has inserted, each after the stanza to which it refers. Probably the earlier stanzas with their replies have been torn away. I need not print Miss Law's stanzas for I have this summer found the whole poem from which they are taken, in the Corpus Christi College, Oxford MS. referred to already. That collection contains the following poems, all in the same hand-writing: (1) Bacon's poem signed 'F. B.,' (2) a Latin verse rendering of the same signed 'G. S. Equit. et Baronetti f. A. M.,' (3) the reply to Bacon's poem, (4) a Latin verse rendering of this reply signed 'H. B.,' (5) (apparently in the same hand, but at a different part of the MS. volume) Sir Thomas Roe's lines 'Upon the Glorious King of Sweden.'

The reply to Bacon's poem runs as follows:

The World's a Globe of State, our Life a Raigne,
Man Soueraigne:
Begot with pleasure, and brought up in daies
With sports and playes:
Courted while youthfull, and when Riper yeard
Honourd and feard.
Who on this Rock doth stand, or Ocean steere,
Rests in his Center, moues as in his Sphaere.

Blessings so crowne each place, Tis hardly guesst
What Life is best:
The Court is Honors wombe, transforming Clods
To Demigods:
The restfull Country Eden speakes, in all,
Except the Fall:
And the trim Cities Plenty-horne imparts
Treasures to all, but above all, her Arts.

Wiues share our Cares by daie, wee their Delight
Much more by night:
The Virgins like an Epicoene Phoenix shown,
Both Twins in one;
The Childlesse are their own Heires; Sons give breath
Even after Death:
The Mayden then, or Mariage state will bee
A Single Paire, or double Vnitie.

We dote on Home, as if that Mother Earth
Gaue our Soules birth:
Trauaile descryes mens Customes, Habits, Parts;
And these their harts:
Warre is a Kingdoms Physicke, Peace its Health,
Their off-spring, Wealth:
What then remaines but that we choose of twaine,
Never to dye, or streight be born againe?

l. 15. Cities] Cities, *MS.* l. 19. Epicoene] Epicoene, *MS.*
l. 25. Wee fancy home as if that attoned earth, *Miss Law's Version.* Prof. Dowden, who showed me the article, conjectures 'atomed' for 'atoned.'

This it will be seen is a very free expansion of the epigram of Metrodorus, as Bacon's is of that of Posidippus. One of the most interesting touches in the original, ἐν δ' ἀγροῖς φύσιος χάρις, is delightfully and characteristically rendered:

> The restfull Country Eden speakes, in all,
> Except the Fall.

'I do not know,' says Professor Mackail, 'any other passage in classical literature where "the beauty of nature" in the completely modern sense of the words is spoken of so explicitly.' The Elizabethan rendering is not so 'completely modern' as the Greek.

The MS. affords no clue to the authorship of the poem. 'Warre is a kingdoms Physick' echoes Bacon's essay *Of the true Greatnesse of Kingdomes and Estates*: 'And certainly, to a Kingdome or Estate, a Iust and Honourable Warre is the true Exercise. A Civill Warre, indeed, is like the Heat of a Feaver; But a Forraine Warre is like the Heat of Exercise, and serveth to keepe the Body in Health.' It may be noted also that the 'The World's a Globe of State' recalls the sentence in the Essay *Of Great Place*, 'For Imitation is a Globe of Precepts'; and that the line 'Rests in his Center, moues as in his Sphaere' reminds us of the famous metaphor in the Essay *Of Truth*, 'Certainly, it is Heaven upon Earth, to have a Mans Minde move in Charitie, Rest in Providence, and Turne upon the Poles of Truth.' What is said, too, about the married state is on the lines of the Essay *Of Parents and Children*, Children 'increase the Cares of Life; but they mitigate the remembrance of Death.' 'The Childlesse are their own Heires' is, I suppose, a condensed manner of saying, 'The Perpetuity by Generation is common to Beasts; but Memory, Merit, and Noble workes are proper to Men.' Or does it rather mean that their wealth is more entirely their own? 'There are some other that account Wife and Children but as Bills of changes. Nay more there are some foolish rich covetous Men, that take a pride in having no children, because they may be thought so much the richer' (*Of Marriage and Single Life*). Possibly Bacon wrote both poems but thought the first alone deserving of circulation as by himself.

But Bacon's verses called forth other poems on the theme of Court, Country, and Town. Miss Law points out in the article referred to that this is the subject of Donne's longest verse letter to Sir Henry Wotton, that beginning, 'Sir, more than kisses, letters mingle soules, etc.' As Donne's poem is well known, I need not quote more than a few lines, and I shall take some of those which Miss Law quoted 'with a view to

show that in writing thus Donne must have been acquainted with this particular poem,' i.e., Bacon's *The World*. I quote from the 1633 text:

> Life is a voyage, and in our lifes wayes
> Countries, Courts, Towns are Rockes or Remoraes:
> They breake or stop all ships, yet our state's such,
> That though then pitch they staine worse, wee must touch.
> . . . . . .
> Cities are Sepulchres, they who dwell there
> Are carcases, as if no such there were.
> And Courts are Theatres where some men play
> Princes, some slaves, all to one end, and of one clay.
> The Country is a desert where no good
> Gain'd (as habits not borne) is understood.
> There men become beasts, and prone to more evils;
> In cities blocks; and in a lewd Court devills.

Bacon's lines:

> And where's a City from all vice so free,
> But may be term'd the worst of all the three?

are clearly echoed in Donne's:

> Cities are worst of all three; of all three?
> (O knotty riddle) each is worst equally.

Donne's contribution brings us to the question of the date of the poems. Miss Law, assigning *The World* to Sir Henry Wotton, considered that the period when it was written was most probably some time between 1610 and 1615, when Wotton was out of favour with the king and when, to quote Miss Law's words, 'Wotton's correspondence with his intimate friend and kinsman Sir Edward Bacon was characterised by a reckless bitterness of tone, astonishing in one usually so politic.' In these letters he frequently burst into bitter invective against the Court: 'This place of such servility in the getting, and such uncertainty in the holding of fortunes.' Or again, in reference to the logicians of the Court and their fickle judgments he writes: 'For yet I never in the Country, nor much less in the Court, see anything done of this kind that was not afterwards approved by those that had most opposed it.' Miss Law finds a clue to the date in the mention of the Epicoene which she takes to be a reference to Jonson's comedy. This is out of the question. Indeed the only argument for Miss Law's date is the parallel, in the new verses given above, with Bacon's essay *Of the true Greatnesse of Kingdomes and Estates*. This was not published till 1612. The argument has not much force, however, if Bacon himself wrote the poem. The essays, too, were known to his friends before publication.

If Donne's poem was written as a reply to or comment on Bacon's, this must be assigned an earlier date. It was only comparatively soon

after Wotton's return from his first long residence abroad that Donne would have addressed him in the terms in which his letter closes:

> But, Sir, I advise not you, I rather doe
> Say o'r those lessons, which I learn'd of you:
> Whom free from Germane schismes, and lightnes
> Of France, and faire Italies faithlesnesse,
> Having from these suck'd all they had of worth,
> And brought home that faith which you carried forth
> I throughly love: But if my selfe I haue won
> To know my rules, I haue, and you haue Donne.

This is a suitable compliment to pay to a young man: it would not be quite so appropriately offered to one who had been for five years his country's ambassador at Venice.

But there is conclusive evidence that the poetic *débat* took place before 1598. On the '3 Aprilis' [1598] the following entry appears in the Stationers' Register: 'Jone Brome Wydowe Entred for her copie under the handes of Master Kinge and Master Man, *Seven bookes of Epigrammes* wrytten by Thomas Bastard whereunto are added *Three Slepers* by the same Author vjd.' In the course of the year appeared

'*Chrestoleros.* Seuen Bookes of Epigrames written by T. B.

> Hunc novere modum nostri servare libelli,
> Parcere personis: dicere de vitiis.

Imprinted at London by Richard Bradock for I. B. and are to be sold at her shop in Paules Church-yard at the signe of the Bible. 1598.'

This volume contains epigrams addressed to Essex, Egerton and Wotton which suggest that Bastard was attached to the same group of adherents of Essex as Donne, Wotton and Bacon. The fourth epigram of Book II has been quoted more than once, but its exact significance becomes apparent when taken in connection with the poems I have given. It runs thus:

> *Epigr.* 4. *Ad Henricum Wottonum.*
>
> Wotton, the country and the country swayne,
> How can they yeeld a Poet any sense?
> How can they stirre him up or heat his vaine?
> How can they feed him with intelligence?
> You have that fire which can a witt enflame
> In happy London Englands fayrest eye:
> Well may you Poets have of worthy name,
> Which have the foode and life of Poetry.
> And yet the Country or the towne may swaye,
> Or beare a part, as clownes do in a play.

What Bastard means by the 'fire which can a witt enflame,' 'the foode and life of poetry,' is the Court, otherwise the last two lines would lack point. I have not got the *Chrestoleros* at hand (only some notes and extracts made in Professor Saintsbury's library) but Corser

(*Collectanea*, II, 211) says 'there is little doubt that Bastard was well acquainted with the Greek Anthology.' It is worth noting that the *Chrestoleros*, like the Planudean Anthology, is divided into seven books. The influence of the Anthology on Elizabethan and Jacobean epigrams deserves some attention.

If the poems in question were written before 1598, they must have been written after 1594, when Wotton returned to England. I incline to date their composition 1597–8, at some period between the return of the Islands' Expedition in October, and April 1598, when Bastard's volume was registered. There is no proof that Donne was a courtier before the Cadiz expedition (1596). His earliest verse-letters would seem to have been *The Storm* and *The Calm* (1597). On the 20th of July 1598 he wrote to Wotton a letter referring to their joint expeditions and in the same vein as the poems in question:

> Here's no more newes then vertue: I may as well
> Tell you Cales or Saint Michaels tales for newes, as tell
> That vice doth here habitually dwell
>
> Yet as to get stomachs we walk up and down,
> And toyle to sweeten rest; so may God frown
> If but to loath both, I haunt Court, or Towne.

Bacon, Donne and Wotton were all in 1597 in the unhappy position of suitors, kicking their heels, or toiling at ungrateful tasks, in the hope that Essex' influence might find them profitable employment; and Essex was playing his cards badly. On the 30th of October 1597 Wotton writes to the Earl begging 'that if there grow any actions between her Majesty and the Emperor wherein your Lordship may make any use of that time which I bestowed in these countries, and in this Court, it please you to employ me.' A letter to Cecil also contemplates an embassy to Germany; but it was not till 1599 that Wotton found employment and went to Ireland with Essex, whither Donne sent him another verse-letter. For Bacon the year 1597, like so many before it, was a period of hope and disappointment and debt and suitorship and unprofitable labour. Donne too had apparently some months of waiting and suitorship before he entered Egerton's service:

> What is hee
> Who officers rage and suitors misery
> Can write and jest?

are his words after he had found a haven[1].

[1] Mr E. K. Chambers indeed has suggested, in this Review (October 1910), that Donne was at this date employed by Cecil on missions to France. It is an interesting suggestion and seems to be borne out by the extracts he has given. I still feel some doubt, however, because Mr Chambers' extracts probably refer to the same person as is

If in their hours of enforced idleness Bacon and Donne and Wotton interchanged verses suggested by some Greek epigrams, it was not a purely literary exercise. Their verses reflected their feelings. Bastard's lines, indeed, are the utterance of a poet sighing in the country for the delights of London life; but the other poems strike a deeper note. Whoever wrote the reply to *The World*, based on Metrodorus' reply to Posidippus, it was clearly not so widely circulated, probably because it was more entirely a *tour-de-force*.

But satire of the Court, the Country and the Town was not confined to the epigram. In *Every Man out of his Humour*, written in 1598 and acted in 1599, Jonson opens on the same scent. The characters whom he elaborates with such fierce scorn fall into the three groups,— the Court represented by Sir Puntarvolo, Carlo Buffone, Fastidious Brisk and Saviolina, the Town or City by Deliro, Fallace, Fungoso, the Country by Sordido. Sordido's character is a complete expression of that feeling about the Country to which Donne gives utterance:

The Country is a desert, etc.

It is in a different spirit that Shakespeare contrasts Court and Country in *As You Like It*; but his satire of the Court in *Hamlet* is hardly less trenchant than Jonson's.

I have kept Wotton's own contribution to the last. Miss Law contended that *The World* was written by Wotton himself. I have not proved that Bacon is the author, but I think I have added to the probability that Farnaby's ascription was correct. And this probability is increased by the discovery that Wotton did write a poem which is much more in the stoical but sweet-blooded vein of 'How happy is he born and taught' than Bacon's despondent lines. The poem has never

mentioned in an entry I came upon the other day in the Cecil papers. It is a note of introduction from Sir Robert Cecil to Essex dated Jan. 1598/9:

'This gentleman, Mr Done, hath made earnest unto me to recommend his suit unto you to have command of one of the companies that go now into Ireland. He saith he hath heretofore followed you in some of your actions and that his name hath been by Sir Richard Bingham and others set down among those who are fit to take charge in Ireland.'

Is this the poet? He had followed Essex in his actions at Cadiz and the Azores. But was Donne in January 1599 still unemployed? This seems hardly compatible with his statement in March 1602 that he had been four years in Egerton's service. Is there any evidence that Donne the poet was known to and apparently esteemed a capable soldier by that old veteran Sir Richard Bingham? Is it not probable that the person referred to in Mr Chambers' extracts and mine is the Donne twice mentioned in Fynes Moryson's account of the rebellion in Ireland. In 1599 he mentions among the wounded in a fray 'Master Done was shot in the leg,' and again in 1600 'A Gentleman of his Lordship's chamber called Master Done (that carried his cloke) shot through the leg,' *Fynes Moryson's Itinerary* (Maclehose) II, 269, 341. His Christian name is not given, and I cannot find another reference to him, but John Donne seems to have been a fairly common name. Looking for Moryson's soldier in the State Papers and Privy Council Registers I have found one baker and one recusant of the name.

hitherto been printed, so far as I know. I have met with it in two MSS. In one of these it is erroneously ascribed to Donne himself, but in the other it immediately precedes Donne's own contribution to the *débat*,

Sir, more than kisses letters, etc.

and is headed and runs thus:

To J: D: from Mr H: W:

Worthie Sir
Tis not a coate of gray or Shepherds life
Tis not in feilds or woods remote to liue,
That adds or takes from one that peace or strife
Which to our days such good or ill doth giue:
It is the mind that makes the mans estate
For euer happy or unfortunate.

Then first the mind of passions must be free
Of him that would to happiness aspire;
Whether in Princes Pallaces he bee
Or whether to his cottage he retire;
For our desires that on extremes are bent
Are frends to care and traitors to content.

Nor should wee blame our frends though false they bee
Since there are thousands false for one that's true,
But our own blindness that we cannot see
To chuse the best although they be but few:
For hee that every fained friend will trust
Proues true to frend but to himselfe vnjust.

The faults we haue are they that make our woe,
Our virtues are the motiues of our ioye,
Then is it vaine if wee to deserts goe
To seeke our bliss or shroud us from annoy:
Our place need not be changed but our will,
For everywhere wee may do good or ill.

But this I doe not dedicate to thee
As one that holds himself fitt to advise,
Or that my lines to him should precepts bee
That is less ill then I, and much more wise;
But 'tis no harme mortality to preach,
For men do often learne when they do teach.

What we may imagine to have happened is briefly this. Bacon's attention was attracted either by the Greek epigrams or (which I think is more probable) by the versions in *The Arte of English Poesie*, a book which excited considerable interest. It is referred to by Sir John Harington in 1591 and was used just about the date of these poems by Meres in preparing his *Palladis Tamia* (1598). Bacon tried his hand at one or both of the epigrams, catching up and amplifying Puttenham's division of Court, Town, Country. He sent that which expressed his own feelings to Wotton, who, like himself, was in the service of Essex. Wotton showed it to Donne and Bastard, who wrote their comments; and to Donne's weighty and eloquently complimentary letter Wotton replied in a characteristic and equally eulogistic strain.

It may be worth noting that Sir John Beaumont, who entered the Inner Temple in 1596, made a translation of both the epigrams. There is no reference in them to the main theme of Bacon's and Donne's meditations; but Beaumont, a young student, may have been tempted to make his versions by the fact that the theme was in vogue during these years.

Lastly, Bacon's poem in the *Reliquiae Wottonianae* is followed immediately by this epigram:

De morte.

Man's life's a tragedy: his Mothers Womb
(From which he enters) is the tiring Room;
The spacious Earth the Theater; and the Stage
The Country which he liues in: Passions, Rage,
Folly, and Vice are Actors: the first cry
The Prologue to th' ensuing Tragedy.
The former Act consisteth of dumb shows;
The second, he to more Perfection grows;
I'th' third he is a man, and doth begin
To nurture vice, and act the deeds of sin:
I'th' fourth declines: I'th' fifth Diseases clog
And trouble him; then Death's his Epilogue.

Ignoto.

Is not this an expansion—in the same manner as Bacon's *The World* is an expansion of the epigram of Posidippus—of that other epigram in the Anthology attributed to Pallades:

Σκηνὴ πᾶς ὁ βίος καὶ παίγνιον.

'All life is a stage and a game: either learn to play it, laying by seriousness, or bear its pains': if this be so, is it not likely that it was composed about the same time, 1597–8, when Wotton and his circle were turning over the Anthology? If so, it would be earlier than *As You Like It* and may be the link between the Greek epigram and Shakespeare's brilliant expansion. It is difficult to believe that if subsequent to Shakespeare's version, it would not have profited by it. But I am wandering into the region of conjecture.

The chief interest of the few facts I have brought together is, that they throw a small pencil of light upon the lives of Bacon, Wotton and Donne at a time when they must have been in close intercourse with one another. The death of Essex was soon to sunder them. Bacon made himself the chief instrument in procuring the condemnation of his patron; Wotton went into voluntary exile; and Donne digested his spleen in a fragment of sombre and enigmatical satire.

H. J. C. Grierson.

Aberdeen.

DRUMMOND'S INDEBTEDNESS TO SIDNEY.

The influence of Sir Philip Sidney upon Drummond's poetry, which had been strangely overlooked by former editors, was first pointed out by W. C. Ward in his edition of *The Poems of William Drummond of Hawthornden* (London, 1894). W. C. Ward instances a number of passages and single lines in which that influence is unmistakable; and also draws attention to certain sonnets which were obviously fashioned on the pattern of certain other sonnets in *Astrophel and Stella*. My researches into the French and Italian sources have led me to make a very minute study of the Scottish poet's verse, and as a result of my investigations I have discovered that the indebtedness of Drummond to Sidney is considerably larger than Ward concluded. Drummond's habit, already noted by Ward, of skilfully weaving Sidney's very phrases into the web of his own verse, makes it probable that a certain number of examples have escaped my attention, but those which I cite, added to those already gathered by Ward, make a sufficiently imposing array. In two instances, as the late Professor David Masson showed, Drummond transplanted two powerful passages from Shakespeare into his own poetry without any acknowledgment[1]. These, together with the numerous borrowings from Sidney, suggest an interesting clue to the student of Drummond's poetic style. Many of the brightest flowers of his rather over-florid style may prove one day to have been culled from the favourite poets on his shelves. I merely throw out this suggestion for what it is worth, and declare that my researches have not corroborated the suspicion I once entertained that a majority of the striking lines in Drummond's verse were stolen property, and that he had systematically, pen in hand, ransacked his favourite poets, jotting down the finest lines for incorporation in his own poetry. This he undoubtedly did in the case of Sidney; practically all the outstanding lines of *Astrophel and Stella* can be paralleled

[1] *Drummond of Hawthornden: The Story of his Life and Writings.* London, 1873, p. 69.

in Drummond's sonnets; and this probably because he thought him and declared him to be the greatest English poet who ever wrote on the subject of Love. Of Sidney's *Arcadia*[1] also he was a fervent admirer, and to it he is indebted in almost equal measure, especially in the longer poems. The other Elizabethan sonneteers he had also read carefully and studied: he notes that the sonnets of Shakespeare have lately been published; praises those of his friend Sir William Alexander and those of Daniel; declares that Drayton 'seemeth rather to have loved his Muse than his Mistress'; and makes the startling assertion that Spenser's *Amoretti* are 'so childish' that they cannot very well be the work of so distinguished a poet. Constable's *Diana* he knew by report only, and Lodge's *Phyllis* he notes as having been read by him in the year 1611. To all these, however, Drummond owes very little, except perhaps a reminiscence or two from Spenser's *Amoretti* and from Drayton's *Idea*.

For the sake of convenience and clearness I will begin with Drummond's sonnets, noting specific borrowings of single lines and passages first, and then more general resemblances between two given compositions:

But, God wot, wist not what was in my brain: (Sonnet I, l. 8.)
Best companied when most I am alone. (IV, l. 11.)
Ere in these mansions blind they come to dwell. (VII, l. 5.)

But (God wot) wot not what they mean by it. (*Ast. and Stell.* LXXIV, l. 6.)
Seem most alone in greatest company. (*Ast. and Stell.* XXVII, l. 2.)
What needed so high spirits such mansions blind? (*Arcadia*, p. 187.)

Drummond addresses sleep as,

Indifferent host to shepherds and to kings. (IX, l. 3.)

Apostrophising sleep Sidney had written before him:

Th' indifferent Judge between the high and low.
(*Ast. and Stell.* XXXIX, l. 4.)

I long to kiss the image of my death. (IX, l. 14.)
These tears, and the black map of all my woe. (X, l. 14.)

O tongue in which most luscious nectar lies. (XIII, l. 5.)

Those flow'rs are spread which names of princes bear. (XVII, l. 7.)
In colour black to wrap those comets bright. (XVIII, l. 6.)

A dull desire to kiss the image of our Death. (*Arcadia*, p. 332.)
But think that all the map of my state I display. (*Ast. and Stell.* VI, l. 13.)

And through those lips drink nectar from that tongue. (*Ast. and Stell.* LXXXIII, l. 13.)
And you, O flowers, which sometimes princes wear. (*Arcadia*, p. 572.)
In colour black, why wrapt she beams so bright? (*Ast. and Stell.* VII, l. 2.)

[1] *Arcadia* is quoted according to E. A. Baker's edition (London, 1907).

Shrill treble, weep; and you, dull basses show. (XXVIII, l. 5.)
And serve no God who doth his churchmen starve. (XXXI, l. 12.)

Trebles sing high, as well as bases deep. (*Ast. and Stell.* LXX, l. 6.)
Till that good God make church and churchman starve. (*Ast. and Stell.* V, l. 8.)

In the opening lines of Sonnet XL:

> Ah! who can see those fruits of Paradise,
> Celestial cherries, which so sweetly swell,

Drummond, apart from more general reminiscences, would probably not have used the same phraseology if his predecessor had not already addressed Stella's 'sweet swelling lips' (Sonnet LXXX), and described them as 'cherries' (Sonnet LXXXII) and as 'fruits of new-found Paradise' (Sonnet LXXXI). These are no doubt minutiae, but they serve to show that Drummond borrowed Sidney's very epithets.

What snaky eye, grown jealous of my peace. (XLIII, l. 5.)
What mourning weeds, alas! now dost thou wear! (XLIV, l. 5.)

Nor envie's snaky eye finds any harbour here. (*Arcadia*, p. 297.)
Wear these my words as mourning weeds of woe. (*Arcadia*, p. 482.)

A few examples may now be quoted from Ward's second volume. In the sonnet entitled 'The Book of the World' occurs a passage which manifestly re-echoes certain lines in Sonnet XI of *Astrophel and Stella*:

But silly we, like foolish children, rest
Well pleased with colour'd vellum, leaves of gold.
Fair dangling ribbons, leaving what is best,
On the great writer's sense ne'er taking hold.

For like a child, that some fair book doth find,
With gilded leaves or coloured vellum plays;
Or, at the most, on some fair picture stays:
But never heeds the fruit of writer's mind[1].

Again in a commendatory sonnet prefixed to Patrick Gordon's *Historie of Penardo and Laissa* we read:

> Thy sire no pick-purse is of others' wit.

which is paralleled by:

> I am no pick-purse of another's wit.
> (*Ast. and Stell.* LXXIV, l. 8.)

In writing the first of the 'Five Sonnets for Galatea' (Ward II. p. 127) Drummond had no doubt in mind Sonnets III and V of *Astrophel*

[1] Cp. also *Arcadia*, p. 112:

> So have I seen trim books in velvet dight,
> With golden leaves, and painted babery
> Of silly boys, please unacquainted sight.

and Stella, but also, I think, the following passage of Sidney's *Apologie for Poetrie*, in which he found an expression almost identical with the one he uses in the closing line of his sonnet: 'But truely many of such writings as come vnder the banner of vnresistable loue, if I were a Mistres, would neuer perswade mee they were in loue; so coldely they apply fiery speeches, as men that had rather red Louers writings, and so caught vp certain swelling phrases.' I ought to have said that the last line of Drummond's sonnet reads:

O no, thou learn'dst thy love in lovers' books.

The examples so far quoted may, I confess, appear somewhat finical at first sight, separated as they are from their context. Those that follow are much more convincing.

As regards more general resemblances between single poems, the first to present itself occurs in Sonnet v. The general movement and central idea is at once seen to be identical with that in Sonnet xxx of *Astrophel and Stella*:

How that vast heaven intitled First is roll'd,
If any other worlds beyond it lie,
And people living in eternity,
Or essence pure that doth this All uphold;
What motion have those fixed sparks of gold,
The wand'ring carbuncles which shine from high,
By sprights, or bodies, contrare-ways in sky
If they be turn'd, and mortal things behold;
How sun posts heaven about, how night's pale queen
With borrowed beams looks on this hanging round,
What cause fair Iris hath, and monsters seen
In air's large fields of light, and seas profound,
Did hold my wand'ring thoughts, when thy sweet eye
Bade me leave all, and only think on thee.

Whether the Turkish new moon minded be
To fill his horns this year on Christian coast,
How Poles' right King means, without leave of host,
To warm with ill-made fire cold Muscovy,
If French can yet three parts in one agree,
What now the Dutch in their full diets boast,
How Holland's hearts—now so good towns be lost—
Trust in the shade of pleasing Orange tree,
How Ulster likes of that same golden bit,
Wherewith my father once made it half tame?
If in the Scottish Court be welt'ring yet;
These questions, busy wits to me do frame:
I cumbered with good manners answer do;
But know not how, for still I think on *you*.

But considerations taken from practical politics did not appeal to Drummond's philosophic mind, and he found a more congenial task in adapting the substance of the following passage from *Arcadia* (pp. 332–3):

Those lamps of heav'nly fire to fixed motion bound,
The ever turning spheres, the never moving ground;
What essence dest'ny hath, if fortune be or no;
Whence our immortal souls to mortal earth do flow:
What life it is, and how that all these lives do gather,
With outward maker's force, or like an inward father.
Such thoughts, methought, I thought, and strain'd my single mind,
Then void of nearer care, the depth of things to find.

Drummond's Sonnet VII would certainly not have received its present form but for Sonnet XXV of *Astrophel and Stella.*

Sonnet XVIII, as Ward has already pointed out, recalls vividly Sonnets VII and XX of the same cycle, and the name 'Auristella' was probably chosen not without a thought of Sidney's mistress. Sonnet XIX ('In vain I haunt the cold and silver spring') is obviously written on the pattern of a similar composition in *Arcadia* (p. 122) beginning with the words: 'In vain mine eyes you labour to amend.' Sonnet LIV and *Astrophel and Stella* VI present a very similar parallel, as does also Madrigal II of 'The Second Part' in manner and substance with the madrigal sung by Basilius in *Arcadia.*

I will now pass on to consider Drummond's indebtedness to Sidney in the longer poems.

Already in the *Tears on the Death of Mœliades*, Drummond's first printed poetic utterance, this dependence on Sidney is manifest. The pattern in this case is at once seen to be the 'song of lamentation' uttered by one of the Arcadians at the loss of Basilius—not only in the repetition at given intervals of certain verses driving home the mournful tenor of the whole piece[1], but in specific passages such as the following, in which are cleverly interwoven Sidney's very epithets and expressions:

Mœliades sweet courtly nymphs deplore,
From Thule to Hydaspes' pearly shore.
Delicious meads, whose chequered plain
forth brings
White, golden, azure flowers, which once
were kings,
In mourning black their shining colours
dye,
Bow down their heads, whilst sighing
zephyrs fly.
Queen of the fields, whose blush makes
blush the morn,
Sweet rose, a prince's death in purple
mourn;

The weeping myrrh I think will not
deny
Her help to this, this justest cause of
plaint.
Your doleful tunes sweet Muses now
apply.
. . . . . .

Let pearls be wan with woe their dam
doth bear!
Thyself henceforth the light do never
see,
And you, O flowers, which sometimes
princes wear,

[1] In *Mœliades* a couplet is repeated, whereas in Sidney's dirge it is only a single verse. This device had already been used by Ronsard (ed. Blanchemain, IV. p. 239) with whose verse both Sidney and Drummond were well acquainted. It may also be noted that such repetitions, serving a similar purpose, are very frequent in the *Nuove Fiamme* (a collection of sonnets, eclogues and elegies) of Lodovico Paterno (1561) of which Drummond possessed a copy.

O hyacinths, for aye your AI keep still,
Nay, with more marks of woe your leaves now fill;
And you, O flower of Helen's tears first born,
Into those liquid pearls again you turn;
Your green locks, forests, cut; in weeping myrrhs,
The deadly cypress, and ink-dropping firs,
Your palms and myrtles change; from shadows dark,
Wing'd syrens, wail; and you, sad echoes, mark
The lamentable accents of their moan,
And plain that brave Mœliades is gone.
Stay, sky, thy turning course, and now become
A stately arch unto the earth, his tomb;
Over which aye the wat'ry Iris keep,
And sad Electra's sisters which still weep.
Mœliades sweet courtly nymphs deplore,
From Thule to Hydaspes' pearly shore.
Tell these strange alt'rings you did hap to try,
Of princes' loss yourselves for tokens rear.
Lily in mourning black thy whiteness die:
O Hyacinth let AI be on thee still,
Your doleful tunes sweet Muses now apply.
. . . . . .
O Echo, all these woods with roaring fill,
And do not only mark the accents last,
But all, for all reach out my wailful will:
One Echo to another Echo cast.
. . . . . .
And well methinks becomes this vaulty sky
A stately tomb to cover him deceased.
Your doleful tunes sweet Muses now apply.

(*Arcadia*, pp. 572–3.)

The same piece also contains reminiscences of Sidney's sonnet-cycle. Sidney says:

> I never drank of Aganippe well;
> Nor never did in shade of Tempe sit:
>
> (*Ast. and Stell.* LXXIV.)

and the Scottish poet duly re-echoes the lines in:

> Chaste maids which haunt fair Aganippe's well
> And you in Tempe's sacred shade who dwell.

Because Night, in Sonnet XCVII of *Astrophel and Stella*,

> Herself . . . . . .
> Silent and sad in mourning weeds doth dight,

therefore, in the *Death of Mœliades*, she

> Ever appears in mourning garments dight.

The graceful song 'It was the time when to our northern pole' (Ward, I. p. 32) is still more redolent of Sidnean imagery. Compare for example:

> When I, in simple course, free from all cares,
> Far from the muddy world's captiving snares,
> By Ora's flow'ry banks alone did wander,

with,

> When I, disgraced wretch, not wretched then did give
> My senses such relief, as they which quiet live,
> . . . . . .
> Free all my powers were from those captivating snares,
> Which heavenly purest gifts defile with muddy cares.
> (*Arcadia*, p. 332.)

Other striking parallels are quoted by Ward from the same poem which it would be tedious to repeat here. To these may be added:

> Her neck seemed fram'd by curious Phidias' master,
> Most smooth, most white, a piece of alabaster:

which recalls Sidney's:

> A hill most fit for such a master,
> A spotless mine of alabaster. (*Arcadia*, p. 182.)

These lines occur in the description of the bathing nymph, which should be read throughout to fully comprehend Drummond's methods.

In Sonnet LXVIII of *Astrophel and Stella* Sidney had written:

> With voice more fit to wed Amphion's lyre.

Drummond's version is:

> A voice surpassing far Amphion's lyre. (Ward, I. p. 180.)

In *Eurymedon's Praise of Mira* (Ward, I. p. 180) the line:

> So wooden globes bright stars to us set forth,

is also conveyed from Sidney:

> Models such be wood globes of glistering skies.
> (*Ast. and Stell.* XCI, l. 11.)

A still better illustration of the imitative habits of Drummond's Muse is afforded by the lines that follow, taken from the *Hymn of the Fairest Fair*:

> Stars, host of heaven, ye firmament's bright flow'rs,
> Clear lamps which overhang this stage of ours,
> Ye turn not there to deck the weeds of night,
> Nor, pageant-like, to please the vulgar sight;
> Great causes, sure ye must bring great effects,
> But who can descant right your grave aspects.

In which is embodied the substance of Sonnet XXVI of *Astrophel and Stella*:

> Though dusky wits dare scorn astrology,
> And fools can think those lamps of purest light—
> Whose number, ways, greatness, eternity,
> Promising wonders, wonder do invite—
> To have for no cause birthright in the sky,
> But for to spangle the black weeds of Night,
> Or for some brawl, which in that chamber high
> They should still dance to please a gazer's sight.
> For me, I do Nature unidle know,
> And know great causes great effects procure,
> And know those bodies high reign on the low.

Sufficient evidence, I venture to think, has been put forth to prove that Drummond's indebtedness to Sir Philip Sidney is such that it can hardly be justified by a nice literary morality. At first sight one might indeed be tempted to conclude that the laird of Hawthornden made use of Sidney's poetry as a storehouse of poetic expression, a kind of *gradus ad Parnassum* when inspiration failed him. But on more deliberate consideration, it is seen that much tact and discernment have been exercised. Drummond's fine poetic sense and musical ear almost without exception saved him from lapsing into mere patchwork; of many of the pearls he found in Sidney's verse he enhanced the beauty by a more brilliant and artistic setting. Yet it is undeniable that he lacked originality and invention, and as a consequence that spontaneity which is the criterium of the true lyric poet is absent from much of his verse. In his defence it may be urged that poets were then less punctilious in such matters than they have since become. This is especially true of those of the poets of his day who still remained like himself belated disciples of a generation which had done its work, and who looked back for models by which to fashion themselves, instead of trusting to their own individual vision[1].

L. E. Kastner.

Manchester.

[1] I am not aware that English literature offers any quite parallel case, but in France and in Germany the same methods, roughly speaking, were employed by two poets almost contemporary with Drummond—Martin Opitz and Mathurin Regnier. That Opitz's poems are often a mere tessellation from Ronsard was detected long ago by Beckherrn and others. More recently Joseph Vianey in his admirable study on Mathurin Regnier (Paris, 1896) has demonstrated that the French satirist had used a somewhat similar method of conveyance (less clumsily than Opitz, and more on the lines of Drummond) not only from his favourite poet Ronsard, but also from the pages of Jodelle, Baïf, Belleau and Desportes.

THE OLD ENGLISH 'EXODUS,' ll. 63—134.

As this passage stands there is considerable confusion in the arrangement and order of the matter. The description of the pillar of cloud is immediately followed in l. 86 by the third encampment, with a brief allusion in ll. 93 sqq. to the two pillars, as though *both* had been already described, whereas only the pillar of cloud has hitherto been spoken of, no mention whatever of the pillar of fire having been made. Then the trumpets summon the host to arise, and the Israelites resume their march. Here the narrative is suddenly interrupted by a description of the pillar of cloud, as though it were something new (*oðer wundor*) and had not been alluded to before. Then we are abruptly carried back to the journey of the Israelites to the Red Sea.

I venture to suggest that a simple transposition of ll. 86—107 and ll. 108—124 will restore order and yield a perfectly natural sequence of events, and I print them below with the arrangement thus altered.

We now get (1) ll. 63—67, second encampment; (2) ll. 68—85, description of the pillar of cloud; (3) ll. 108—124, description of the pillar of fire; (4) ll. 86—107, and ll. 125—129, third encampment and further march until stopped by the Red Sea; (5) ll. 129—134, fourth encampment.

The cause of the displacement of the two passages was, no doubt, the wrong folding of a couple of leaves in the MS. from which Junius XI was copied or at any rate descended. If we assume that the two joined leaves in the middle of a quire, containing 1a + 1b (= ll. 108—124) and 2a + 2b (= ll. 86—107) respectively, got wrongly folded and were thus bound, the sequence in the MS. would be 2a, 2b, 1a, 1b, which is the actual sequence in the Junius MS. That the pages contained so few lines (1a + 1b = 17 lines, and 2a + 2b = 22 lines) can be accounted for by assuming spaces for pictures.

Heht þa ymb twa niht tirfæste hæleð,
siððan hie feondum oðfaren hæfdon,
ymbwicigean werodes bearhtme,
mid ælfere Æthanes byrig,
mægne mæste mearclandum on.
Nearwe genyddon on norðwegas,
wiston him be suðan Sigelwara land,
forbærned beorhhleoðu, brune leode
hatum heofoncolum. Þær halig god
wið færbryne folc gescylde,
bælce oferbrædde byrnendne heofon,
halgan nette hatwendne lyft.
Hæfde wederwolcen widum fæðmum
eorðan ϧ uprodor efne gedæled,
lædde leodwerod; ligfyr adranc,
hate heofontorht. Hæleð wafedon,
drihta gedrymost. Dægscealdes hleo
wand ofer wolcnum; hæfde witig god
sunnan siðfæt segle ofertolden,
swa þa mæstrapas men ne cuðon,
ne ða seglrode geseon meahton
eorðbuende ealle cræfte,
hu afæstnod wæs feldhusa mæst.
Æfena gehwam oðer wundor,
syllic æfter sunnan setlrade beheold
ofer leodwerum lige scinan,
byrnende beam. Blace stodon
ofer sceotendum scire leoman,
scinon scyldhreoðan, sceado swiðredon;
neowle nihtscuwan neah ne mihton
heolstor ahydan. Heofoncandel barn;
niwe nihtweard nyde sceolde
wician ofer weredum, þy læs him westengryre,
har hæð[broga], holmegum wederum
o[n] ferclamme ferhð getwæfde.
Hæfde foregenga fyrene loccas,
blace beamas, bellegsan hweop

63. *MS.* tirfæstne. *Cp. Cosijn PBB.* 19, 460. 67. *MS.* mægnes. *Or read* mægna, *gen. pl.*? 70. *MS.* burhhleoðu. *Cp. note.* 81. *MS.* swegle. 113. *MS.* sceaðo. 118. *MS.* har hæð. *Cp. Cosijn PBB.* 19, 460. 119. *MS.* o.

in þam hereþreate, hatan lige,
þ he on westenne werod forbærnde,
nymðe hie modhwate Moyses hyrde[n].
Siððan he mid wuldre geweorðode
þeodenholde; þa wæs þridde wic
folce to frofre. Fyrd eall geseah
hu þær hlifedon halige seglas,
lyftwundor leoht; leode ongeton
dugoð Israhela þ þær drihten cwom,
weroda drihten wicsteal metan.
Him beforan foran fyr ȝ wolcen
in beorhtrodor, beamas twegen,
þara æghwæðer efngedælde
heahþegnunga haliges gastes,
deormodra sið dagum ȝ nihtum.
Þa ic on morgen gefrægn modes rofan
hebban herebyman hludan stefnum
wuldres woman. Werod eall aras
modigra mægen, swa him Moyses bebead,
mære magoræswa metodes folce,
fus fyrdgetrum; forð gesawon
lifes latþeow liftweg metan.
Segl siðe weold, sæmen æfter
foron flodwege; folc wæs on salum,
hlud herges cyrm. Heofonbeacen astah;
scean scir werod, scyldas lixton,
gesawon randwigan rihte stræte,
segn ofer sweoton, oð þ sæfæsten
landes æt ende leodmægne forstod,
fuson forðweg. Fyrdwic aras,
wyrpton hie werige; wiste genægdon
modige meteþegnas hyra mægen beton.
Bræddon æfter beorgum, siððan byme sang,
flotan feldhusum; þa wæs feorðe wic,
randwigena ræst be þan readan sæ.

124. *MS.* hyrde. 87. *MS.* þridda. 104. *MS.* lifweg. 105. *MS.* swegl. 128. *MS.* leo mægne.

NOTES.

68. This line of course means, 'The difficulties facing them (*nearwe*, i.e. the heat, if they took a southerly direction) forced them to the north.' It does not mean with Grein, 'Mit Nachdruck eilten sie an Nordwege,' nor with Johnson, 'Straitly they pressed on the northern roads.'

70. MS. *burhhleoðu*. The original no doubt had *beorhhleoðu* 'mountain slopes.' It is true that a similar misspelling is recorded once, viz. Riddle 28^2, but the *eo* form is the only one found elsewhere. It occurs *Elene* 788 and 1009; *Exodus* 448; *Riddle* 58^2; *Genesis* 2159 (where the MS. has *beorh-*, not *burh-*, as is erroneously given in Grein's *Sprachschatz*). Conversely in the glosses we meet with the misspelling *beorhleod* 'municeps' for *burh-*, where the original undoubtedly had *burh-*: cp. Napier, *O. E. Glosses*, note to 7, 293.

109. The difficulty in this line seems to be the *beheold*. One expects a verb meaning 'began,' and, though *ongann* would be a bold emendation, it would yield good sense. 'Each evening another wonder, a strange one, after the setting of the sun, began to shine with flame over the people, a burning pillar.' There is however great difficulty in seeing how the mistake could have arisen.

107. *Heofonbeacen astah*, 'The heavenly beacon (the sun) arose.'

129. Instead of *fus on forðweg*, the reading of the MS., which is retained in most of the editions, I propose to read *fuson forðweg*. 'Until the sea-fastness (i.e. the Red Sea) at the limit of the land blocked the further journey to the host, to the eager [troop].' For *fuson*=*fusum*, cp. *sweoton*, l. 127 etc. *Forðweg* is the object of *forstod*. In most cases where it occurs it is preceded by the preposition *on*, and the phrase *fus on forðweg* (*Menologium* 218 and *Guthlac* 918, cp. also *Guth.* 773) must have been familiar to the scribe. This led him to divide *fuson f.* into *fus on f.*

Arthur S. Napier.

Oxford.

SPENSER'S 'HOUSE OF ALMA.'

In the ninth canto of the Second Book of the *Faery Queene* there is an elaborate allegory representing the human body as a castle in which the soul (Alma) resides. The working out of the allegory in detail is necessarily a *tour de force*, resulting occasionally in forced conceit and imperfect analogy. On the whole the interpretation presents few difficulties, though some points have been missed by commentators through imperfect acquaintance with medieval physiology. But there is one stanza which has caused perplexity to scholars, from Sir Kenelm Digby to Dr Kitchin. I hope to show that the traditional explanation, first offered by Sir Kenelm Digby and accepted with modifications by the Clarendon Press editor, is in part unsound and in part incomplete. The stanza is the twenty-second:

> The frame thereof seemd partly circulare,
> And part triangulare; O worke divine!
> Those two the first and last proportions are;
> The one imperfect, mortall, fœminine,
> Th' other immortall, perfect, masculine;
> And twixt them both a quadrate was the base,
> Proportiond equally by seven and nine;
> Nine was the circle sett in heavens place;
> All which compacted made a goodly diapase.

The House of Alma is the habitation of the soul, and therefore 'the frame' is the human body. Hence the traditional interpretation, which makes the circle represent the soul, and the triangle the body, seems unsatisfactory. The mention of the circle and the triangle in connection with the structure of the human body suggests a reference to the *Timaeus* of Plato, where the creation of man by the gods is described in detail. (Hence perhaps the exclamation, 'O worke divine!') 'First then the gods, *in imitation of the spherical shape of the universe*, bound the two circles of the soul in *a spherical body*,—that, namely, which we now call *the head*, which is man's most divine member, and the ruler of our whole composition' (chap. XIX). The circular part therefore of

the House of Alma was the head. Passing on to the composition of the body, Plato mentions earth, air, fire and water as its constituents, and proceeds: 'First, then, that fire and earth, water and air are bodies, is evident surely to everyone. But every species of body possesses solidity; and every solid must necessarily be contained by planes. Again, a base formed of a perfectly plane surface is composed of triangles' (chap. XXVIII). Thus the human body, like all other solids, is ultimately composed of triangles. Spenser therefore, who was an enthusiastic student of Plato[1], here in all probability refers to the trunk of the body as triangular in contrast with the circular head.

The triangle played an important part in the theories of the Pythagoreans, who employed the properties of a right-angled triangle (with sides proportioned to 3, 4 and 5) 'to explain and enforce their embryological theories[2].' Plato also employs this triangle in discussing the period of the pre-natal development of the human animal[3]. Thus in this passage of Spenser there is a trace of Pythagorean as well as of Platonic speculation.

The triangle and the circle are 'the first and last proportions,' that is, the most elementary and the most perfect geometrical forms respectively. The triangle is the plane figure formed with the least possible number of straight lines; and on the other hand it was a doctrine of Pythagoras that the circle is the most beautiful of linear figures[4].

Of these, Spenser says, the circle is 'immortal, perfect, masculine,' contrasting in each particular with the triangle. He here probably contrasts the head, as containing the immortal rational soul, with the body as the receptacle of the mortal soul. As Plato divides the mortal soul into distinct parts which he implicitly distinguishes as male and female[5], Spenser here seems to contrast the immortal soul as masculine with the mortal soul as feminine.

Common to both parts of the body thus described—the head and the trunk (with the limbs)—is the underlying quadrate. As in an allegory the language must be applicable to both interpretations, the quadrate as a geometrical figure will represent part of the structure of the castle. The word 'quadrate' most commonly means 'square,' but it is sometimes used[6] in the sense of 'rectangle.' In this geometrical sense the castle contains a rectangular base court whose sides are in

[1] J. W. Hales, 'Memoir of Edmund Spenser,' in Globe edition, pp. xxi, xxxiii sq., liii.
[2] Adam, *Plato's Republic*, Bk. VIII, App. I, ii, § 4.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Encyclop. Brit.*, Art. Pythagoras.
[5] *Timaeus*, c. XLIV.
[6] *N.E.D.* s.v. 'quadrate.'

the proportion of seven and nine. (The word 'equally' will then refer to the equality of the opposite sides.) As applied to the human body the word 'quadrate' must refer to the old physiological theories which represented the body as composed of the four elements (earth, air, etc.), the four elementary contraries (heat, cold, dryness and moisture), and the four humours. These theories were commonplaces in the medical writings of the sixteenth century[1]. The Pythagorean *tetrad* (which occurs in the Golden Verses) had a similar application, if we may trust a late interpreter[2]; though the medical theories were not fully developed until towards the end of the fifth century B.C.

The seventh line of Spenser's stanza is the most difficult of interpretation as applied to the human body. Dr Kitchin says that 'seven' refers to the influence of the seven planets, and 'nine' to the ninth sphere which is referred to as 'summus ipse Deus.' On the face of it there seems an improbability in an interpretation which makes one of these numbers a cardinal and the other an ordinal. A more probable explanation seems to lie in the ancient significance of the numbers seven and nine in relation to the human body. The mystical power of numbers was a striking feature of ancient Greek speculation, as may be seen for example in Plato's discussion of the period of gestation of the Divine animal in the Eighth Book of the *Republic*. Aristotle in commenting on this passage objects to this attribution of influence to numbers. So that in saying that the quadrate in the human body is proportioned, that is, arranged in due proportion, by the numbers seven and nine, Spenser is using Platonic methods.

The particular significance of these two numbers is shown by Sir Thomas Browne in his *Vulgar Errors* (Bk. IV, c. 12). After remarking that number has 'received adjectives from the multiplying conceits of men,' he proceeds: 'And so perhaps hath it happened unto the numbers seven and nine, which multiplied into themselves do make up sixty-three, commonly esteemed the great climacterical of our lives. For the days of man are usually cast up by septenaries, and every seventh year conceived to carry some altering character with it, either in the temper of body, mind or both. But among all other, three are most remarkable, that is, seven times seven or forty-nine, nine times nine or eighty-one, and seven times nine or the year of sixty-three, which is conceived to carry with it the most remarkable

[1] E.g., Vicary, *The Anatomie of the Bodie of Man* (E.E.T.S.).
[2] Comment. of Hierocles on the Golden Verses of the Pythagoreans, tr. Rayner, 1797, Lect. xx, p. 75.

fatality, and consisting of both the other numbers was apprehended to comprise the virtue of either, is therefore expected and entertained with fear, and esteemed a favour of fate to pass it over.' He later argues against the efficacy of numbers as causes, and after quoting Aristotle (as above) he continues: 'Ptolemy, that famous mathematician, plainly saith he will not deliver his doctrine by parts and numbers, which are ineffectual and have not the nature of causes. Now by these numbers, saith Rhodiginus and Mirandula, he implieth climacterical years, that is septenaries and novenaries set down by the bare observation of numbers. Censorinus, an author of great authority and sufficient antiquity, speaks yet more amply in his book, *De Die Natali*, wherein expressly treating of climacterical days he thus delivereth himself: "Some maintain that seven times seven, that is forty-nine, is most dangerous of any other, and this is the most general opinion; others unto seven times seven add nine times nine, that is the year of eighty-one, both which consisting of square and quadrate numbers, were thought by Plato and others to be of great consideration: as for this year of sixty-three, or seven times nine, though some esteem it of most danger, yet do I conceive it less dangerous than the other; for though it containeth both numbers above named, that is seven and nine, yet neither of them square or quadrate; and as it is different from them both, so it is not potent in either."'

I conclude therefore that Spenser in the passage before us represents the condition of the human body as determined by the mystical numbers seven and nine. In the next line, however, he gives additional significance to the number nine by identifying it with 'the circle sett in heavens place.' It is possible that this circle may simply be the spherical head described in the first line, for in a subsequent description of the head (Stanza 45) he refers to it as

> Like highest heaven compassed around,
> And lifted high above this earthly masse.

In that case nine, which was regarded by the Pythagoreans as a perfect number, is assigned to the perfect form of the circle. We should then have to identify the other number seven with the body, and to explain it by a belief of the Pythagoreans[1] that the development of the embryo proceeded according to the proportions of the harmony or octave, with its seven musical intervals. This would also account for the use of 'diapase' in the last line, i.e., the complete octave.

[1] Adam, *Plato's Republic*, VIII, *loc. cit.*

If this interpretation seems fanciful, we must regard the 'circle sett in heavens place' as the complete celestial sphere consisting of nine concentric spheres. In that case Spenser regards the mystical number nine, so influential in human life, as receiving its efficacy from the fact of its being the number of the celestial spheres.

The last line of the stanza states that the whole human body thus joined together formed a beautiful harmony. The diapase was the complete series of musical sounds composing an octave. The line from Dryden (quoted by Dr Kitchin) is not to the point, except as showing the meaning of the word 'diapason.' Dryden says that in the series of created things 'the diapason closes full in man,' that is, man is the concluding and triumphant note of the whole. Spenser says that man by his very constitution is in himself a complete whole, containing all the elements of a perfect harmony.

It is noticeable that in the discussion in the Eighth Book of the *Republic*, Plato combines the ideas of geometrical form, mystical number, and development of the human body. As all these find place in Spenser's description of the House of Alma, we may feel sure that he was indebted to Plato for the main ideas contained in this particular stanza.

P. ANSELL ROBIN.

MELBOURNE.

ÉTUDE SUR QUELQUES VOCABLES ANGLO-NORMANDS.

Les vocables qui forment le sujet de cette petite étude se trouvent dans un manuscrit (Oak Book of Southampton) conservé aux archives de la ville de Southampton. Le texte spécialement étudié ici (fo. 20 a—24 b du MS.) est un tarif des 'Coutumes' de la ville, c'est-à-dire des droits d'entrée et de sortie prélevés sur différentes marchandises. Il se divise en deux parties: la première (fo. 20 a—22 b), probablement rédigée vers 1300, est en anglo-normand; la seconde, datée du mardi de la fête de St Jacques l'apôtre, l'an 3 du règne d'Edouard III (1329), contient à peu près les mêmes termes en latin, ou plutôt en français latinisé.

J'ai été chargé de préparer une édition de tout le manuscrit pour la 'Record Society' de Southampton. Le premier volume vient de paraître, mais le texte des 'Coutumes,' qui d'ailleurs a déjà été publié, avec quelques fautes de lectures, en 1859 par Smirke (*Archaeological Journal*, vol. xvi, pp. 343—350), figurera aux chapitres v et vi du second volume.

Enfin, je désire exprimer ici ma reconnaissance à M. Antoine Thomas, membre de l'Institut, professeur à la Sorbonne, qui a eu la bonté de compléter quelques-unes de mes notes.

Arnement (='encre') est une graphie fréquente en anglais dès le commencement du xiv^{e} siècle. Cf. *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'arnement.' L'anglo-norm., d'accord avec l'anc. franç., avait généralement 'arement,' 'arrement' ('atramentum'), ex.: *Boeve de Haumtone*, ed. Stimming, v. 1751.

Arresm me paraît représenter le lat. 'aeramen,' anc. fr. 'arain,' provenc. 'aram' (voir *Dictionn. Hatzf.-Darmst.-Thomas*, art. 'airain'). L'anglo-norm. conserve volontiers 'm' final (autres exemples: 'seym,' fr. 'sain'; 'merym,' fr. 'mairien') et redouble facilement les consonnes: 'aeramen' serait devenu '*erame > *eram > araim > arreim > arrem >

arresm,' avec 's' inorganique. La graphie 'arrem' a été conservée dans un texte anglo-norm. du XIV^e siècle, voir *Domesday of Ipswich*, ed. Twiss, vol. II, p. 190.

BONCHE (on pourrait aussi lire 'bouche,' car le copiste ne fait pas de distinction entre 'u' et 'n') se rencontre dans l'expression 'de la somme des aux, xijd.; de c. bonches vj^xx, vjd.' Le *New Engl. Dict.* ne relève le mot 'bunch' ('bonch'), au sens de 'faisceau,' 'botte,' que dans un texte de c. 1450, tandis qu'il cite plusieurs exemples de 'bunch' ou 'bonch' = 'bosse,' 'protubérance,' appartenant au siècle précédent. Dans l'un et l'autre cas il ne se prononce pas sur l'origine du mot.

Il est certain que le français connaissait déjà de très bonne heure une forme 'bonge' (cf. Godef., art. 'bouge,' où il faut lire 'bonge' au lieu de 'bouge,' cf. *Romania*, XX, p. 618, art. 'boujeau') ainsi qu'un dérivé 'bongeau' ou 'bonjeau.' Behrens rattache 'bonge' au flamand 'bondje,' diminutif de 'bond,' et signale que le wallon 'bonge' s'emploie encore dans l'expression 'bonge d'ognons, bonge d'aux,' etc. (cf. *Zeitschrift für franz. Sprache und Literatur*, XXIX, p. 142).

Il me paraît évident que le mot de notre texte est une forme anglo-norm. de 'bonge.' Les MSS. de Southampton fournissent d'ailleurs de nombreux exemples de ce mot avant 1450: xij 'bonches (ou bouches) de ail' (*Water Bailiffs' Account*, année 1428, fo. 8a); ij 'bonches (ou bouches) de ayl' (id., fo. 26b); l 'bench' (ou beuch') de ail' (id., fo. 44b); xxx 'bunch' allei' (id. année 1434); c et iiij^xx 'bonchys (ou bouchys) allei' (*Brokage Books*, année 1440).

La question se pose, si l'anglais 'bunch' = 'bosse' représente le même mot? Je crois que notre texte permet de répondre affirmativement à cette question, car le mot 'bonche,' bien qu'ajouté après coup dans le MS. de Southampton, appartient certainement au XIV^e siècle, et quant au sens, la transformation qui s'est opérée de 'faisceau' en 'monceau,' 'bosse,' s'explique assez facilement.

CHAT, mot obscur, se trouve dans l'expression 'chat d'argent vif,' et sous sa forme latine dans 'pro cato argenti vivi.' Smirke (*Archaeol. Journal*, XVI, p. 345) l'a rattaché à 'chatus,' 'casatus' = 'ponderis species,' que Du Cange cite d'après un ancien glossaire. Peut-être faudrait-il lire 'chant' et dans le texte latin 'canto' ou 'canta,' et le faire remonter à une source germanique ('kanta,' 'kante,' variante de 'kanna,' angl. 'can,' voir Kluge, *Etymol. Wörterbuch*, art. 'kanne')? Ou bien, puisqu'il est question de mercure, aurions-nous ici un mot d'origine espagnole?

COIGNE s'employait couramment en anglo-norm. et en moyen angl. au lieu de 'coing,' 'coin' (<'cuneum'). Mais le texte exige plutôt un nom de poisson, et déjà Smirke (*Archaeol. Journal*, XVI, p. 347) l'avait rattaché à 'coin de mer' = 'a kind of mullet fish,' que Cotgrave signale dans son Dictionnaire. Cependant ni Godef. ni le *New Engl. Dict.* ne relèvent cette signification.

CONYNGE, variante de 'coning,' 'conin,' forme parallèle de l'anc. fr. 'conil,' 'connil' (*New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'cony'); 'e' inorganique se développe souvent à la fin des mots anglo-norm., cf. 'cordewane,' ci-dessous; notre MS. offre encore d'autres exemples de ce phénomène, ainsi 'clowe' pour 'clou' (<'clavum').

CORDEWANE (en réalité un adj. formé de 'Cordova,' 'Cordoue'), voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'cordwain,' angl. 'cordwainer,' fr. 'cordonnier' sont des dérivés de ce mot.

COUPLE ('de la couple des ffyges et Reysyns,' dans le texte latin, 'pro coupl' ffiki et reysin'') dénote une mesure et me paraît devoir représenter l'anc. fr. 'copele,' 'coupelle' (lat. 'cuppella' < 'cuppa') avec déplacement d'accent. Godef. relève ce vocable comme désignant une petite mesure de froment, et Du Cange, sous 'cupa' 3, mentionne 'cupellus = mensura frumentaria.' Par contre cette signification n'est pas relevée en angl. dans le *New Engl. Dict.* Généralement les figues et les raisins étaient transportés dans des 'frael,' 'frayel' ou 'frail,' voir ce mot dans le *New Engl. Dict.* Ce n'était cependant pas le cas à Southampton. J'ai relevé dans les *Water Bailiffs' Accounts*, conservés aux archives de la ville, les expressions suivantes: cl sport de figues, ccij sport de Resins, Cust. [= Custome] xiiijs. viijd. (année 1428, fo. 21 b); xvij pec. de Resins (id., fo. 19 b); iiij pec. de figue, Cust. ijd. (id., fo. 30 a); j pipe plein de fig (id., fo. 52 a); xl qrt [= quarter] de Resins, Cust. xd. (id., fo. 52 b); vij sport de fig', Cust. vijd.; iiij sportin de Resin, Cust. ijd.; iiij sport de Resin, Cust. iiijd. (année 1436, 2e partie, p. 15). A supposer que les droits sur cette marchandise n'aient pas varié, ce qui est très probable, 'la couple' serait l'équivalent de 'sport,' fr. 'esporte' (sporta), et représenterait un poids de quatre quarters, soit d'un quintal.

DOWLES, voir POLDAWIS, ci-dessous.

FEYNZ, plur. de 'feyn' (='feyne'), forme anglo-norm. de 'fayne' (*'fagina')—voir Du Cange, art. 'faina.' La forme fr. 'fouïne' est dérivée de 'fou' ('fagum'), voir *Dictionn. Hatzf.-Darmst.-Thomas.*

Flotes (dans l'expression 'de chescun Cent des fflotes'), équivaut à flottes de liege,' que Godef. relève dans le Complément. Dans les textes anglo-norm. je n'ai pas rencontré l'expression entière, mais soit 'flote,' soit 'lege' (='liege') employé indépendamment. Dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, pp. 192, 194, on distingue même entre 'flote' ='large float' et 'lege' ou 'corkel' ='small float.'

Fother ('del ffocher [= ffother] de plombe,' 'pro ffocher [ou ffother] plumbi'), vocable angl., voir 'fotmel,' ci-dessous. Au lieu de 'fother' l'anglo-norm. employait de préférence le terme équivalent 'karre' ('carre,' 'charre'), voir *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 190.

Fotmel ('de ffotmel de plombe,' dans le texte lat., 'pro fotmell'), vocable angl. 'fotmal' (voir ce mot, *New Engl. Dict.*), valait généralement 70 livres ou la trentième partie du 'fother.'

Geyde, weyde, wayd, wolde, exemple frappant de l'inconstance de l'orthographe anglo-norm.: le vocable est employé quatre fois dans notre texte, et chaque fois il est écrit différemment. Les trois premières graphies se rattachent à l'anc. fr. 'gaide' et 'waide,' la dernière au moyen angl. 'wod,' 'wad.'

Gobette paraît être une variante féminine de 'gobet'; seulement ce vocable, du reste assez répandu en moyen angl. et anc. fr., et qui s'est même conservé dans l'usage actuel, signifiait toujours 'morceau, pièce, fragment, bouchée,' tandis que le contexte n'admet guère une telle signification. Il est assez probable que 'gobette' ou 'gobet' ait été employé comme nom local de poisson, peut-être, comme le pensait déjà Smirke (*Archaeol. Journal*, XVI, p. 347), pour désigner le 'lumpfish,' fr. 'lompe.' M. Barbier, professeur à l'Université de Leeds, a eu l'obligeance de me signaler l'italien 'gobetto,' que Florio traduit 'somewhat buncht or crookback'd; also a little hunchback'd man; also a lump-fish.' Il est donc possible que 'gobet' (gobette), comme nom de poisson, ait même été d'un usage assez général (bien que le *New Engl. Dict.* n'en cite pas d'exemple), d'autant plus que le terme moderne 'lumpfish' paraît être d'introduction récente (XVI^{e} siècle, d'après le *New Engl. Dict.*).

Graspois, variante de 'graspeis' (voir ce mot dans Du Cange). On trouve aussi en anglo-norm. et en angl. 'grapais,' 'grapays' (par ex.: *Black Book of the Admiralty*, ed. Twiss, vol. I, p. 152, texte anglo-norm. du XIV^{e} siècle), remplacé au XVI^{e} siècle par 'graundepose,' 'grampoys,' mod. 'grampus,' 'grampas' (voir ce mot, *New Engl. Dict.*).

GREINZ, graphie anglo-norm. de l'anc. fr. 'graine' = 'cochenille.' En général 'e' final s'est maintenu dans ce vocable, par ex.: 'greyne' dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, XIV^e^ siècle, ed. Twiss, vol. II, p. 188; 'i balet de greine pur drap' (*Water Bailiffs' Account*, A.D. 1428, fo. 18 b, Archives de Southampton). Cependant dans un MS. de la même époque j'ai trouvé, 'bala...grani pro pannos tingend,' (*Black Book of Southampton*).

LATH, graphie angl. qui au XIV^e^ siècle a remplacé la forme plus ancienne 'latt' (anc. angl. 'lætt'), *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'lath'; *Dictionn. Hatzf.-Darmst.-Thomas*, art. 'latte.' La graphie 'lathes' se trouve aussi dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 200.

LEENG représente le moyen angl. 'lenge,' 'lienge,' angl. mod. 'ling,' voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'ling'; *Dictionn. Hatzf.-Darmst.-Thomas*, art. 'lingue,' et Thomas, *Essais de phil. franc.*, p. 328, art. 'lingue.'

LOKERAM, voir POLDAWIS, ci-dessous.

LYKEMOSE me paraît être une forme hollandaise ('leecmos,' 'lijcmos,' mod. 'lakmoes') de laquelle s'est développé plus tard l'angl. mod. 'litmus.' Le *New Engl. Dict.* ne donne pas d'exemple antérieur à 1502. Il est à noter cependant que le *Liber Albus* de Londres (c. 1419), p. 238, contient une graphie 'lytemoise.'

LYNGETELE, composé de l'adj. 'linge' ('linea') et du subst. 'tele,' fr. 'toile' ('tela'). Au lieu de 'tele,' on trouve généralement une graphie plus régulière 'teile,' 'teyle' (*Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 196), mais aussi 'tiele,' 'tielle' (Gross, *Gild Merchant*, vol. II, p. 206). Un composé semblable a été formé avec 'lange' ('lanea'), 'laungeteyle' (*Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 196). Avec d'autres substantifs, 'linge' et 'lange' suivent généralement le nom; dans l'ouvrage que je viens de citer, on trouvera, p. 132: 'draps tayllez, launges, ne lynges, ne parceles de teux draps...ne fyl launge, ne lynge....'

MACES, variante de 'macis,' qui était la graphie la plus répandue en anglo-norm. et en anc. fr. (voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'mace'; Godef. et Du Cange, art. 'macis'). 'Maces' marque la transition entre 'macis' et l'angl. mod. 'mace,' puisqu'il avait tout à fait l'apparence d'un pluriel.

MAKERELLE, variante féminine de l'anc. fr. 'makerel,' fr. mod. 'maquereau.' 'Muluwelle' pour 'muluel' est un cas analogue, ainsi que 'gobette' pour 'gobet.'

MARTRINZ ('del Cent des Sabelyns, Matrinz [= Martrinz], ffeynz, Gopiles et chatz, ijd.') était, comme 'sabelyns,' adjectif à l'origine, et désignait la fourrure de la martre (voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'marten'); l'anc. fr. 'martrine' s'employait de la même façon.

MOELE, MEOLE, MOLE, s'employaient à peu près indifféremment en anglo-norm. pour représenter plusieurs mots, entre autres: (1) Le lat. 'mola' = 'meule à moudre': la graphie 'moele' se trouve dans notre texte, aussi dans la *Vie de St Thomas* (Paget Toynbee, *Specimens of Old French*, p. 196, v. 109); 'meole' dans *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 188, où le mot a été traduit à tort 'bale'; 'mole' deux fois dans *Boeve de Haumtone*, ed. Stimming, vv. 238, 336. (2) La racine germanique représentée par l'anc. h. allem. 'malha,' moyen angl. 'male,' angl. mod. 'mail,' anc. fr. 'male.' Du Cange a relevé 'mola' = 'minor sarcina quam summa' dans les *Capitulaires de Charlemagne*, à côté de la forme plus courante 'mala.' La forme anglo-norm. 'meole' (traduite 'male' dans la version anglaise du XV^{e} siècle) revient à plusieurs reprises dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, pp. 180, 196, etc. (3) Le lat. 'musculus,' fr. 'moule' (f.): anglo-norm. 'mole' = 'muskelys,' angl. mod. 'mussel' dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 160. (4) Lat. 'medulla,' fr. 'moelle': 'meole' dans Marie de France, *Fable* 57, v. 14, ed. Warnke.

MULUWELLE, voir MAKERELLE, ci-dessus; pour le sens voir Godef., 'moruel,' et *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'melwell.'

NUCIS MUGUE, ou MUGE ('pro qualibet bala gyngiberis, Canele... nucis mugue, Croci...'), au lieu de 'nucis muscate,' est une forme refaite sur l'anglo-norm. '*nois mugue, muge' (anc. fr. 'nois mugede') qu'on n'a pu relever jusqu'ici, mais qui est nécessaire à l'explication de l'angl. 'notemugge,' mod. 'nutmeg' (voir ce mot dans le *New Engl. Dict.*).

OLZINE est une forme douteuse que je n'ai pas rencontrée ailleurs. Le *New Engl. Dict.* cite 'allron,' 'olron,' 'oldryn,' etc., comme variantes d'"oleron,' auxquelles il donne le sens de 'toile grossière fabriquée à Oléron.' M. Antoine Thomas m'a obligeamment fait remarquer que ce n'est pas Oléron mais Olonne qui fabriquait des toiles. En effet, dans les *Water Bailiffs' Accounts* de Southampton j'ai relevé à plusieurs reprises (par ex.: année 1428, fo. 1 b, 3 a, etc.) le vocable 'oulone' (= 'étoffe de toile'), qui ne figure pas au *New Engl. Dict.* Il n'est pas invraisemblable qu'"olzine' ne soit qu'une erreur pour 'olonne.'

PELECE, variante de 'pelice,' 'pelisse.' Les MSS. français et anglais de Southampton, du XIV^e^ au XVI^e^ siècle, offrent des exemples, souvent nombreux, de la confusion de 'e' et de 'i,' surtout devant une sifflante. Le même phénomène se retrouve dans notre texte dans 'maces' pour 'macis,' 'pointelle' pour 'pointille.'

PELIRE, variante de 'pelure' ou 'pellure' (cette dernière était la forme la plus répandue en anglo-norm., *New Engl. Dict.*). Le changement de 'u' > 'i' n'est pas inconnu en anglo-norm., cf. 'alym' pour 'alum' dans notre texte.

PIONIUS ('pro bala pionii'), forme latine tirée de l'anglo-norm. 'pione' (< '*peonia,' 'paeonia'), voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'peony.'

PITZ ('de chescun Barille de tarre et de pitz') a subi l'influence de l'angl. 'pitch' (moyen angl. 'pich,' anc. angl. 'pic'), car par l'intermédiaire du français, le lat. 'picem' aurait donné en anglo-norm. 'peis' ou 'pes.'

POINTELLE ('de la pointelle de wolde'), variante de 'pointille'—Cotgrave (*A French-English Dictionary*, 1650) relève ce mot au sens de 'a pricke or prickle, a little nice point, the smallest or sleightest matter that may be'—forme parallèle de 'pointet' = petite quantité, voir Godef. Pour ce changement de suffixe cf. 'char(r)etil' et 'char(r)etet.' J'ai aussi trouvé l'expression 'pointel de Wolde' dans un autre MS. de Southampton (*Water Bailiffs' Accounts*, année 1428, fo. 50 a).

POLDAWIS, DOWLES, LOKERAM (ajoutés après coup au texte, mais avant la fin du XIV^e^ siècle) sont des substantifs dérivés de noms propres de lieux (situés en Bretagne) désignant les étoffes grossières qu'on y fabriquait, voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'poldavis,' 'dowlas,' 'lockram.'

POMADRE = 'cidre,' se rattache sans doute à une forme méridionale pomade' (voir Roquefort, aussi Du Cange, art. 'pomata'), qui cependant a souvent supplanté l'équivalent 'pomede,' 'pomee' (voir ces mots dans Godefroy). Kelham mentionne 'pomadre' = 'powder.'

PORPAYS, graphie anglo-norm. (et anglaise du moyen âge) de l'anc. fr. 'porpeis' (bas lat. 'porcus' + 'piscis'), alterne avec 'porpeys,' dont notre texte offre un exemple et que l'on trouve aussi dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 198.

Poys ('pensum'), dans l'expression 'fformage de poys,' alterne dans les textes anglo-norm. avec 'peyse' (bas lat. 'pensa')—'peyse de formage' se trouve dans un autre texte du MS. fo. 18 b—quelquefois même avec 'waghe' ('waghe de formage' dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 192) et représente l'anglais 'weigh' ou 'wey,' qui pesait alors 256 livres avoirdupois.

Quibusks ('de la bale de Peyuere..., Maces, Quibusks, Clowes,...') est une corruption de 'quibibes,' qui était la graphie généralement usitée en anglo-norm. et en moyen angl., mais qui a été supplantée dans l'usage moderne par une forme plus récente 'cubeb' (fr. 'cubèbe' < bas lat. 'cubeba'), voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'cubeb'; Godef. Compl. et *Dictionn. Hatzf.-Darmst.-Thomas*, art. 'cubèbe.'

Sabelyns, en réalité un adjectif employé substantivement, dérivé de 'sable,' 'sabel' (bas lat. 'sabelum,' 'sabellum')—voir *New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'sable'; Du Cange, art. 'sabelum.'

Saye, saie ('de chescun draps de Saye, iiij d.') en anglo-norm. et en moyen angl. représente (1) l'anc. fr. 'seie,' 'soie' ('seta'), par ex. dans *Boeve de Haumtone*, ed. Stimming, v. 738; (2) l'anc. fr. 'saie' ('*saga,' 'sagum'), étoffe de laine, voir *Century Dict.*, art. 'say.' Les droits considérables prélevés sur cet article, en comparaison de ceux qui sont perçus sur les autres étoffes, portent à croire qu'il s'agit dans notre texte d'un tissu précieux, probablement d'un tissu de soie.

Sclate, variante de l'anc. fr. 'esclat,' paraît avoir ici le sens moderne de l'angl. 'slate' (voir ce mot, *Century Dict.*).

Seel en anglo-norm. représente généralement le lat. vulg. '*sigellum' (c'est d'ailleurs aussi la graphie de l'anc. fr.) et parfois le lat. 'sal,' notre texte en fournit un exemple, on trouvera la même graphie dans Bozon, p. 107. Mais aucune de ces significations ne convient à l'expression 'de la Rule de Seel et de tref.' Ici nous avons sans doute le moyen angl. 'seil' (anc. 'seȝ(e)l,' angl. mod. 'sail') représentant la même racine germanique que 'sigle' (*Alexis*, v. 79, Wace: cf. Du Cange, art. 'sigla') et 'single,' fr. 'cingler.'

Sedewale et cedewal, variantes anglo-norm. de 'citoual' (='citouar' <'*zedoarium,' 'zedoaria'). En moyen angl. les formes anglo-norm. ont remplacé l'ancien sideware,' voir *Century Dict.*, art. 'setwall.'

SEGE ('de la sege de vn Nef, ij d.'), variante anglo-norm. de 'siege,' se rapporte ici aux droits perçus sur les bateaux pour la permission d'ancrer dans un port. Du Cange a relevé cette signification du mot 'siege' (voir art. 'sedes' 4, 'sedes navium,' 'segiagium').

SEU ('sebum'), cette forme se retrouve en provenç. tandis que dans le Nord de la France on employait 'siu' ou 'sui' (*Dictionn. Hatzf.-Darmst.-Thomas*, art. 'suif'). En anglo-norm. la forme la plus répandue paraît avoir été 'sieu' ou 'siew' (voir Gross, *Gild Merchant*, vol. II, p. 206 et gloss.; La Curne; Godef. Compl.), cependant j'ai rencontré 'su' dans un texte du XIV^e^ siècle (*Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 192) et 'suy' dans un autre du XV^e^ (*Water Bailiffs' Account*, année 1428, fo. 9 a, Archives de Southampton).

SEYM (bas lat. 'sagimen' < 'sagina') alterne avec 'seyme.' Des formes doubles existaient aussi en moyen angl. ('saim, sayme, seme,' etc. *Century Dict.*, 'seam') et en français (Godef., art. 'sain,' 'saime').

SKYREUX représente l'anc. fr. 'esquirel' + s. L'emploi de 's' au lieu de 'es' devant consonne n'est pas rare en anglo-norm.; autre exemple, 'sclat' pour 'esclat.'

TARRE (voir PITZ, ci-dessus), angl. 'tar,' au XIV^e^ siècle ce mot paraît avoir été employé comme synonyme de 'geme' (voir ce mot dans Godef.), on lit en effet dans le *Domesday of Ipswich*, vol. II, p. 184: 'De chescun baryl de pyz ou de jemme, j d.' traduit dans une version du XV^e^ siècle 'Off every barell of pych or of terre, j d.'

WAYD, WEYDE, voir GEYDE, ci-dessus.

WHICE ('de chescun Whice, j d.'), graphie due à l'angl. (moyen angl. 'whicche,' anc. angl. 'hwicce'), et qui peu à peu tendit à disparaître pour faire place à la forme française 'huche'—*New Engl. Dict.*, art. 'hutch.' Godef. relève les graphies 'wiche' et 'uiche' (Godef. Compl., art. 'huche').

WOLDE, voir GEYDE.

P. STUDER.

SOUTHAMPTON.

EIN HISTORISCHES LIED VOM SCHMALKALDISCHEN KRIEG[1].

Meines Wissens ist das Lied, das ich im folgenden Abdrucke, bis jetzt noch nicht ans Licht getreten. Die Eigenart seiner Überlieferung möchte darauf deuten, dass es in mündlicher Tradition herumlief und aus dieser vielleicht nur dieses eine Mal zur schriftlichen Aufzeichnung kam, die ein Zufall uns erhalten hat. Ich fand das Lied auf dem British Museum, eingetragen auf vier Papierblätter (18 cm. hoch, 14·3 cm. breit), die dem Drucke: *Auff das Christliche absterben... Doctoris Martini Lutheri durch M. Johannem Stigelium MDXLVI Vitebergae* nachgeheftet sind. Druck und Manuskript, die beide leider stark beschnitten worden sind, bilden mit anderen Drucken des 16. Jhd. den Sammelband 11517. c. 59 (1—11); die handschriftlichen Blätter sind darin als siebentes Stück gezählt. Zwei Hände des 16. Jhd. haben das Lied, kaum lang nach seiner Entstehung und vielleicht aus dem Gedächtnis hier niedergeschrieben in flüchtiger deutscher Kursive, in abgesetzten Versen (ausgenommen Strophe 1) und die Strophen am linken Rande von 1—22 numerierend, wobei jedoch Strophe 20 zweimal gezählt wurde. Der ersten Hand gehört Strophe 1—18; der Rest sowie einzelne Korrekturen in den voraufgehenden Strophen rührt von Hand 2 her. Orthographische Eigentümlichkeiten der beiden Hände, wie die Wiedergabe des anlautenden *b-* durch *p-* (*pesten, ptrogenn, puwin, pöttlein, poswicht*, etc.), des in- und auslautenden mehrmals durch *w* (*erwe* 2. 5, *puwin* 7. 2, 4, *huw* 5. 2), des anlautenden *k-* durch *kh*, des *j-* durch *g* in *gagt* 20. 2, 3, ferner der häufige Zusammenfall von *im* (dat.) und *in* (acc.) vgl. Str. 1. 4; 6. 4; 7. 3, 5; 9. 4; 15. 5; 17. 1, können nach Obersachsen oder Thüringen weisen, für den südlichen

[1] Vgl. über den Verlauf desselben Liliencron, *Die historischen Volkslieder der Deutschen*, IV, S. 290 ff., 351 ff., 386 f., 418 ff.; F. von Bezold, *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, Berlin, 1890, S. 772 ff.; A. von Druffel, *Des Viglius van Zwichem Tagebuch des Schmalkaldischen Donaukrieges*, München, 1877.

Teil des letzteren Gebietes spräche der apokopierte Infinitiv *bleyb* 12. 5. Die ähnliche Erscheinung in den Reimen *zu* : *thun* 4. 1, 16. 1 ; *schande* : **zergangen* 7, 3 ; *erfaren* : *tage* 10. 3, vielleicht auch *streyt* : **reyten* 21. 2 möchte den Dichter ebenda lokalisieren d.h., in dem Lande, das dem alten sächsischen Kurhaus nach der Katastrophe bei Mühlberg noch allein vom ernestinischen Territorialbesitz geblieben war. Ein herzoglich-(sächsischer) 'Hauptman,' der dem Kurfürsten (Johann Friedrich) manches Jahr gedient, ist es, der uns das Lied gesungen hat, und die Strophe, deren er sich bedient, ist die bekannte Lindenschmid-Strophe (Liliencron, *Hist. Volkslieder*, 2, No. 178 und Nachtrag, S. 68 f.). Mit jenem Lied hat das seinige jedoch auch die Eingangszeilen 1. 1—2 gemein, ausserdem stimmen 2. 4 und 9. 1, zu Lindenschmid 7. 1 und 3. 1, genug um zu sehen, dass dieses Lied ihm in den Ohren summte.

Der 'herzogische' Hauptmann sieht natürlich die Ereignisse, deren Augenzeuge er offenbar war, die wichtigsten Etappen des Schmalkaldischen Krieges in protestantischer Beleuchtung und gibt so ein Gegenbild zu der katholischen, aus dem siegesgewissen kaiserlichen Lager stammenden Auffassung, wie sie sich in so vielen Liedern bei Liliencron (z. B., den No. 536, 538, 540, 548—53) widerspiegelt, wennschon keines derselben, wie das seinige, den ganzen Verlauf des Krieges zeichnet. Alles Licht—darauf weist schon die Überschrift des Liedes—fällt auf seinen Herrn, den Kurfürsten Johann Friedrich. Verrat allein hat ihn ins Unglück gestürzt; Verrat braut schon im Lager zu Ingolstadt; Verrat übt des Kurfürsten Verbündeter der Landgraf Philipp von Hessen; ein Judas[1] ist Herzog Moritz von Sachsen; durch Verrat fällt Johann Friedrich in die Hände des Kaisers, der selbst ein Verräter an Gott und seinem Wort ist; allein die Zeit wird kommen, wann der Herr die 'gross undreyw' strafen wird. Und so durchzieht unser einfaches Liedlein in folgerechter Weise eine weit mehr poetische denn geschichtliche Wahrheit, und sie ist die uralte: das Gute, das Edle muss fallen vor böser List und Tücke.

[1] So heisst er auch in dem Lied no. 572 bei Liliencron, auch wohl no. 561, Str. 11. 4 ; vgl. ferner *Neu. Archiv f. sächs. Geschichte*, 23 (1900), S. 215 ff. *Eyn new liedt von Moritz Hertzogen zu Sachsen*, etc.

EIN LIDT ZU LOEB DEM CHURFURST[EN].

1.

Es ist nicht lang, do es geschae
das ma[n den] churfursten[1] zien sag,
er zog aus seine[m] landee,
es zog in manger frumer lanzknecht zu
auf wasser und auff lan[de].

2.

Und do sye ins peierlant[2] kamen,
die lantzknecht stis ein hunger an,
sie tetten das land verderben.
die lantzknecht getachten in iren mut:
Hie w[irt] des lantz ein erwe.

3.

Sie zogen zu dem wirttenberger[3] ein,
der wirtenperger hiß sie got wilkum sein,
er thedt sye gar schon enpfangen,
er schancke inn ein den aller pesten wein,
dar nach stund der lantzknecht verlangen.

4.

Der wirtenperger sprach uns freuntlich zu,
er woltt uns hilff und beistandt thun,
er woltt nicht unß verlassen,
er woltt uns leyhen stedt, landt und leutt,
den keiser helffen straffenn.

5.

Und da wir kamen fur Ingelstatt[4],
do huw sych ein grosse unthreu ann,
des churfursten hauppttleutt tetten sych sterken.
die haubtleuth tetten der unthreu so vil,
der frum furst woltz nicht merken.

2. 4 lantzknecht] *darnach* gethachen getho *d.h. zwei verunglückte Versuche* getachten *zu schreiben, ausgestrichen.* 5 des] *etwas verschmiert und daher auf dem linken Rand wiederholt.*

3. 3 *Hs.* enpfaen. 4 *Hs.* dem.

5. 1 *Hs.* ingelstatt. 3 sterken] *am Zeilenschluss steht nur* ste, *das ganze Wort ist aber am linken Rand nachgetragen.*

6.

Und da wir khamen fur Thunawherd[5],
sein unthreu hube sich im̄er mher:
der lantgraff[6] hatt in ptrogenn,
er gab in der guttenn wordt so vil,
sye waren halbig derlogen.

7.

Der lanttgraff ein oberster haubtman w[as],
er woldt Maria die puwin[7] nicht schla,
Er sprach, es wher in ein schande.
unnd ehr die puwin zum keysser kho[m],
der streyt whar inn zergangen.

8.

Unnd do wir nhun fur Gengen[8] khamen
ein schlacht ordunnug wir fingen an
nach dem keysser stundt unser verlang[en].
do woltt kein hertzogischer haubtman d...[8],
der keisser plieb vor in allen.

9.

Dem churfursten khamen neue mher,
wie herzog Moritz[9] treuloß wehr,
er lo̊g im in seinen landee.
ehr nhamb in ein die dorffer und die stedt
und treib ein große schande.

10.

Der churfurst woltz glauben nicht,
er schiktt ein reittens pöttlein hin,
die mher recht zu erfharenn.
und eher der herwider kham,
die warheitt waß am tage[10].

6. 1 *Hs.* thuna wherd = *Donauwörth.* 4 guttenn] *über ein ausgestrichenes* falschen *geschrieben.*

7. 4 *zwischen* ehr *und* die *ist* do *über der Zeile ergänzt, aber wieder ausgestrichen.* 5 zergangen] *Hs.* genumen.

8. 1 gengen = Giengen. 2 wir *über die Zeile gesetzt.* 4 hertzogischer] *Hs.* hertzischer *oder ist* hessischer *gemeint? s. unten Anm.* 8. 5 in] *Hs.* im.

9. 5 ein] *darüber vom zweiten Schreiber* viel *geschrieben, doch wieder ausgestrichen.*

10. 2 reittens] = reitends. hin] *davor* da *von der zweiten Hand nachgetragen.* 4 *zwischen* der *und* herwider *von der zweiten Hand* pot *übergeschrieben.*

11.

Wolauff, wolauff! und es ist zeitt
wir komen daheim umb landt und leut
herzog Judeaß[11] leidt uns in lande,
er nimbt uns ein die dorffer und die stedt[12],
er treibt ein grose schande.

12.

Herzog Moritz ist ein treuloß mhan
der seinee wordt nicht haltten khan
wie er mir hatt versprochen,
und hilfftt mir gott mal wider heim,
sol bleyb nit ungrochen.

13.

Do er nhun vor Eisenachtt[13] kahm,
do hett er noch viel tausendt man
"der lanttgraff hatt mich verlas[sen]"[14],
er woldt in das landt zu Sachsen [nicht varn]
wolt seinen eidem nicht straffen.

14.

Der churfurst sprach: "es ist ein los a[rt],
der die rutten an seinen kindern spartt,
sie bleiben doch unerzogen."
und wie der lanttgraff geschworen hatt,
den fursten hatt er btrogen.

15.

Da wir nhun fur Leipzig[15] khamen,
hertzog Moritz sas auff und ritt dorvon,
er ritt aus seinen lande;
wer im der keisser nicht komen zů hylff,
es wher in nit wol ergangen.

12. 4 mal] *von Hand* 2 *zu* ein mal *ergänzt.*
13. 5 eidem] heidem *aber das von der zweiten Hand gesetzte* h *ist ausgestrichen.*
14. 1 los] *die zweite Hand fügt ein* -e *an.* 2 kindern] -n *rührt von Hand* 2.
5 den] *Hs.* dem. btrogen] *darauf von der zweiten Hand* und belogen *hinzugefügt.*

16.

Der Margraff[16] kham sich auch darzu,
woltt herzog Judas beistandt thu,
darnach stundt sein verlangen.
er kham gen Roglitz fur die statt,
darin wartt er gefangenn.

17.

Der keyser zog in hinderhernach
und nach dem churfursten whas im gach,
die unthreu thett er stercken.
der churfurst hett der verretter so vil,
der frumb furst woltz nicht mercken.

18.

Sie nhamen da des keiser geschenck
und verritten den churfursten in seiner hent:
der churfurst wardt gefangen[17].
Sye getachten gottes wordt in einen sack zu stoßen
und an ein nagel zu hangen.

19.

Der keysser zeugt durchs deutsch land,
er spricht, Gott und sein worth ste in seiner handt,
die pauer sprechen, es sey erlogen.
es wirt sych mancher mutter kindt
sein leib und lewen dran wagen.

20.

Der keysser zeugt durch alle straß,
er fegt die hirtten und gagt die schaff,
er gagt in ab die wollen.
Inn kloster und in kuchen seindt der kelch so viel
der keysser nimbtt sie alle[18].

16. 1 sich] *von Hand* 2 *wohl mit Recht eingefügt.* 2 Judas] *das* -s *von Hand* 2. 4 *zwischen* die *und* statt *von Hand* 2 werda (=werte) *übergeschrieben.*
18. 1 da] *von Hand* 2 *übergeschrieben.*
19. 2 ste] *Hs.* sthett. und sein worth] *über der Zeile nachgetragen.* 4 lewen] *über das* w *ein* b *geschrieben.*
20. 4 kuchen] ch *aus* g *korrigiert; ursprünglich wohl* kirchen.

21 (20).

Der keyser furet ein wehlichen streyt,
Es kan kein hirtzogischer haubtman mehr [reyten ?],
sie sitzen do heymen auff dem pfull.
Vnnd wen die pauern pet stewer[19] ge[ben ?]
so reyten die poswichtß hauptman [dorumb ?].

22 (21).

Also hat dieseß lied eine endt,
Gotß worth stehet got in seiner [hendt],
Got wil sein worth nicht verla[ssen].
und wan got wirt ein haupt[man seyn ?]
die groß undreyw wirt er st[raffen].

23 (22).

Der unß dieseß liedlein sa[ng]
daß hatt ein hirtzogisch hauptman g[etan]
er hatts so frey gesungenn,
er hat dem Churfurst manch jar ge[dient],
der keyser hat in verdrungen.

23. 4 *Hs.* Churf: 5 *darunter steht noch* : Daß thut in whee in seiner....

ANMERKUNGEN.

[1] Am 20. Juli 1546 hatten sich die Truppen der norddeutschen Protestanten unter der persönlichen Führung des Kurfürsten Johann Friedrich und des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen bei Meiningen vereinigt ; am 3. und 4. August stiessen sie bei Donauwörth (in Baiern nahe der Würtembergischen Grenze) zu den oberländischen Bundestruppen unter Schärtlin und Schankwitz.

[2] Herzog Wilhelm von Baiern bewahrte eine etwas zweifelhafte Neutralität, augenscheinlich abwartend, auf welche Seite das Kriegsglück sich wenden würde.

[3] Herzog Ulrich von Würtemberg.

[4] In Johann Reinharts noch ungedruckten *Reichsakten*, II (s. Priebsch, *Deutsche Hss. in England*, Bd. II, S. 297 ff.) heisst es f. 243[b] : *Den dritten Augusti ist key. M˜t von Regēnspurg aus zu felde gezogen vnnd auff Donnerstag nach Bartholomei 26. Augusti bey Ingelstat an komen.* Dorthin waren die Protestierenden, die schon auf dem Wege nach Regensburg waren, in Eilmärschen zurückgekehrt. Vom 30. Aug.—2. Septbr. *schossen die protestirenden gegen kay^r M˜t hefftig mit hundert vnd XI buchsen grosse stuck, dagegen sich aber sein M˜t vergraben...Als nun Sachs vnd Hess mit irem hefftigen schissen gegen dem Kaiser nichts aus richten mochten zogen sie auff Sambstag nach Egidii den 4. Septembris ab.*

[5] Der Abzug der Protestanten von Ingolstadt ging über Neuburg und Donauwörth (s. Liliencron, no. 535 Str. 20—21) nach Wernding ; doch kehrte man am 13. September nach Donauwörth zurück.

[6] Philipp von Hessen; sein verunglückter Versuch, das kaiserliche Hilfsheer unter Graf Büren (s. Str. 7) zu treffen und zu schlagen, wird ihm also als Betrug (Verrat) ausgelegt.

[7] Königin Marie, Statthalterin der Niederlande; bezeichnend für den protestantischen Dichter ist der Beisatz *die puwin* (Bübin; Grimm, *DWB*, II, 466). Unter der Führung des in Liedern oft erwähnten Grafen von Büren (s. Liliencron No. 535, 17. 2; 536, 14. 6; 538, 43. 1; 540, 41. 1—3) vereinigte sich dieses Heer unangefochten mit dem Kaiser vor Ingolstadt am 15. September.

[8] Giengen. Hier lagen die Protestanten vom 14. October—23. Nov.; es kam wohl zu zahlreichen Scharmützeln mit den kaiserlichen Truppen (einen protestantisch gefärbten Bericht über solche zwischen dem 15. und 20. October gibt ein Sendschreiben *Warhafftige Zeitungen aus dem Feldlager bey Gengen Anno MDXLVI* (Brit. Mus. 2167 (12)), aber zu keiner entscheidenden Aktion. Bezeichnend ist folgende Stelle aus Reinharts *Reichsakten*, f. 250r: *Auff vorgemelten XVI tag Nouembris* [der Tag, an dem die Protestanten durch Adam Trott, '*des Landgrafen Obersten Leutenant*,' einen zweiten Friedensversuch gemacht hatten] *ist der Hess mit seinem leger vffgeprochen vnnd vber die Prentz gezogen vnnd gegen der kay. M˜t ein hohe eingenomen, aus vrsachen, dan er sterbens halber im alten läger nit pleiben mogen, vnnd das er sein volck mehr zu samen precht. als er die knecht vber das Wasser fürn wollen | haben sie alle dermassen vmb geld geschrien, das er inen verhaissen müssen innerhalb dreyer tag gelt zu geben, dergleichen etlichen vill reutern, so auch nicht hinüber gewolt, innerhalb* 6 *tagen gelt zu geben.* Sollte sich Str. 8. 4 *do wollt kein hessischer* (?) *haubtman d*[*oran* ?] auf diese Verhältnisse beziehen? Da die Protestanten am 23. Nov., am Tage *Presentation Mariae heimlicher flüchtiger weyß in der nacht* aufgebrochen sind, entspricht Zeile 5: *der keisser plieb vor in allen* den Tatsachen.

[9] Herzog Moritz von Sachsen, der Schwiegersohn Philipps von Hessen.

[10] Wahrscheinlich durch einen aus Sachsen gekommenen Boten. Einen solchen fingen die Kaiserlichen am 23. Nov. ab: *do hort man die kleglichesten brief, wie Saxen gar verloren...in Summa, man nimbt mer aus der feindt brief, dann aus unsern aignen* (s. Druffel, a. a. O., S. 193, Note 49).

[11] S. oben S. 2 Anm. 1.

[12] Fast das ganze Kurfürstentum war von seinen und den böhmischen Truppen eingenommen worden, nur Wittenberg und Gotha widerstanden.

[13] In dem Bericht des bairischen Gesandten Bonacorsi Gryn (s. Druffel, a. a. O., S. 242, Note 77) heisst es unterm 25. Dec.: *Herzog Jo. Friedrich von Sachsen ist auf Eisenach in Türingen mit des Grafen von Aldenberg und Reifenbergers zwaien regiment, darunder über vier tausend* (ist 13. 2 demgemäss *viel* in *vier* zu ändern ?) *knecht allenthalben nicht sein, gezogen.*

[14] Spottend meinte man, er sei zu seinen Weibern heimgezogen. Johann Reinhart stellt die Trennung der Verbündeten und den weiteren Zug des Kurfürsten bis Eisenach f. 250b so dar: *Zu Amerbach ist der Hess mit seinen reuttern* 250 *pferde vom Sachsen ab, vnd vff Frankfurt geriten daselbst in die Sancti Andree apti mit grossen eren empfangen, furter sich anheims vnnd gehn Castell gethan daselbst wie man sagt schweine gejagt vnnd mitt kriegen sich nit vill mehr bekümert. Aber der Sachs het bey sich* 3000 *pferd vnnd* 30000 *knecht mit denen zog er heruber auff Brunbach, vnnd als er dasselbig gantz verwüstet het, fiel er in Stifft Meintz auff Miltenberg vnnd Aschenburg, die er listiglich vnnd betrieglich erobertt, schatztt das oberland des Stiffts Meintz vmb* 45000 *gulden, zog darnach an der Synn hinauff, in den Stifft Fulda schatzt denselben vmb* 30000 *gulden, vnnd als er auf sein, vnnd den Stifft rewmen wollen, hat er den Stifft noch ferner vmb* 8000 *gulden geschatztt. Auf Thome apti theten die arme lewt im Stifft Meintz dem Sachsen bezalung zu Fulda geben ire* 45000 *gulden damit prach er auff vnnd zog auff Ysenach.*

[15] Die Belagerung währte vom 5.—27. Jan. 1547 und endete dank der tapferen Gegenwehr des Stadthauptmanns Sebastian von Walwitz für den Kurfürsten sehr schmählich. Joh. Reinhart, der, a. a. O., f. 261 f. recht ausführlich, doch wie es scheint, auf Grund des Liedes Liliencron No. 550, über die Belagerung und Beschiessung der Stadt berichtet, bemerkt zum Schluss folgendes: *In dem kam ein geschrey in des Sachsen läger, Hertzog Moritz, so nit in Leipzigk in der besatzung*

pliben (vgl. oben Str. 15. 2), *were vor handen, völlt ine, den gewesten Churfürsten, von der belagerung abtreyben, des wolt er* (Joh. Friedrich) *aber nitt erwarten, sonder auff den sibenzehendesten (!) tag des Jeners, liess er seine leger, gezelt vnnd hutten verprennen, zog mit spot vnnd schaden wider von der belagerung ab. Aus der Statt schuss man ime mitt fraiden nach vnnd sang ime das liedle Hatt dich schympff gerawen so zeug du wider haym, vnnd klag es deiner frawen* (s. Liliencron, No. 550, 37. 3—5).

[16] Markgraf Albrecht III. von Brandenburg. Über seine Gefangennahme in Rochlitz berichtet Reinhart f. 262[b]: *Nun war Margraue Alberht von Brandenburg auch mit einem guten Kriegsvolck...in Sachsen, lag vber nacht in eim Stetle Rakoltzem genant / vnnd Hertzog Moritz von Sachsen nitt bey ime, deshalben vberfiel ine Hertzog Hans Friderich auff Mittwochen nach Jnvocavit vnmenschlich frue vmb drey hore / lieff das Stetle mit sturmen an, aber Margraue Albrecht vnnd seine kriegslewt wereten sich, etlich schlugen sie zum dritten mal vom sturmen hynwegk. Darnach vmb 9 hore fiel er mit seinen reitern hynaus, mit den feinden zu scharmützeln, der gegenteil war aber zu starck unnd er der Margraue, gefangen.*

[17] In der Schlacht bei Mühlberg, Sonntag den 24. März, 1547. Hier ging allerdings das Gerücht, Verrat sei im Spiele gewesen (vgl. Liliencron 4, S. 419. 35 ff).

[18] Vgl. Liliencron No. 541 *Ein Psalm*, v. 27—30: *Der groß Carolus ist in teutschem land, alles das er will, das wirkt er mit seiner gwaltigen hand. Bilder, kelch, monstranzen, sie weren guldin oder silberin, haben sie gemacht zü talern und guldin ringen.*

[19] Ist *Gebetsteuer* (=*Religionssteuer*) gemeint? Das *poswichtß* der nächsten Zeile geht natürlich auf den Kaiser.

ROBERT PRIEBSCH.

LONDON.

EINE ÄLTERE FASSUNG DER PETRARCAODE VON CARL FRIEDRICH CRAMER.

Am 6. August 1772 schrieb Boie an Bürger: 'Kramer hat nach meinen Ideen endlich sein petrarchisches Lied verbessert; es kostete gewaltig Mühe, eh ich ihn zu einer Aendrung brachte. Ich glaub, es wird auch Ihnen nun gefallen. So bald ich ihm was sage, und Biester denkt nicht just eben so, glaubt er mir nicht mehr. Er hat sicher viel Genie[1].' Das nach Boies Ideen verbesserte petrarchische Lied Cramers erschien als 'Petrarca's Wiedererinnerung in Vaucluse' im *Göttinger* Musenalmanach für 1773, S. 49 bis 54. Die ältere Fassung dieser Ode teile ich hier aus einer Originalhandschrift Cramerscher Jugendgedichte mit, die sich in Kopenhagener Privatbesitz befindet. Zum Vergleich stelle ich die beiden Fassungen nebeneinander: A ist die ältere, B die unter Boies Ägide im Sommersemester 1772 in Göttingen entstandene und im Musenalmanach gedruckte endgiltige Gestalt der Ode.

A.

Ode.

Petrarch an Laura.

Da wo rieselnd und schön, unter balsamischem Duft
Durch die Gräserchen hin, murmelnde Fluthen wälzt
(In dem heiligen Haine
Der das reizende Vauclus schmückt)
Mein geliebtester Bach, saßen im Schimmer des Monds
Ich o Laura und du! War um uns weit herum
Ganz die horchende Gegend
Still! Es rauschte kein Blättchen nicht.

B.

Petrarca's Wiedererinnerung in Vaucluse.

Dolce nella memoria! Petr.

Nicht im Traume getäuscht, welchen der lächelnde,
Blumenschwangere Lenz, oft in Hesperiens
Dornbesäeten Pfaden,
Meinem thränenden Auge schuf;
Grüß' ich froher euch itzt, Myrtenumschattungen
Meines heiligen Hains, grünender Wiesen-Schmelz,
Dich, mit rinnendem Silber,
Liebemurmelnder Bach, dich auch!

[1] Strodtmann, 1, 62.

9 Denn des Tages Gestirn war schon versunken im Meer
Nur ein röthlicher Strahl, floh von dem Berg zurück
Der mit Trauben beladen
Weit umher das Gefild beschaut

13 Und von Osten auf, stieg, sanft in dem weiblichen Schmuck
Gleich der zärtlichen Braut, die von dem edelsten
Besten Jüngling geliebt wird,
Und in seine Umarmung flieht.)

17 Cynthia!...Liebendes Herz! Ach was empfandst du da
Mit der Laura im Arm! War o Petrarch dir nicht
Dieser Schattenwald Tempe?
Und das Thal dir Elysium?

21 Ueber unserem Haupt, winkte der Rosenbaum schön
Ganz von Blüthen beschneyt, sah er sich in der Fluth
Wo ich Laura dich einstens,
Traf im Bade des heitern Quells.

25 Plözlich kam ein Orkan, eben so schnell als er kam
Floh er wieder zurück, denn er verirte sich
Nur, und braußte vom Meere
Wo er ängstliche Schiffer schrekt.

29 Und kein Nebel umzog, traurig Elysium.
Nur die Nachtigall schwieg, und von dem Rosenbusch
Weht' er Blüthen herunter
Ambra duftende Blüthen weg.

9 Wo, bey einsamer Nacht, durch die Natur geweckt,
In der glühenden Brust keimender Lieder Saat
Schneller reifte, wo bebend
Dich, o Laura! die Laute sang.

13 Laura, kennst du ihn noch, kennst du den Wonnetag,
Wo mir leise dein Mund, (Engel umschwebeten
Uns in festlicher Stille,)
Ewig zärtliche Liebe schwor?

17 Schöner sah ich ihn nie! Heitrer und heiliger,
Im umdufteten Hain, athmet' ich nie die Luft;
Niemals fächelte sanfter
Zephyrs lispelndes Wehen mich!

21 Welligt strömte dein Stral, zitterndes Abendroth!
Am vergoldeten Saum bläulicher Wolken hin;
Denn schon waren der Sonne
Flammenräder herabgerollt;

25 Und von Osten auf stieg, stiller, im weiblichen
Im bescheidneren Schmuck, gleich der verschämten Braut,
Die, mit sinkenden Blicken,
Zu des Jünglinges Armen eilt,

29 Luna. Zärtliches Herz, ach! was empfandest du
Da, von Laura geliebt! War er dir damals nicht,
Dieser Schattenwald, Tempe,
Dieses Hainthal Elysium?

33 Ueber unserem Haupt wölbte zur Laube sich
Von dem schlanksten Jasmin, blüthebeschneyt ein Busch,
Und mit Rosen verwebet,
Ihren glühenden Wangen gleich.

37 Plötzlich brauste der Nord!—doch er verstummte bald,
Fernte bald sich zurück zu dem empörten Meer,
Wo der muthige Schiffer
Auf der thürmenden Woge tanzt.—

41 Und kein Nebel umzog dämmernd den Myrtenhain;
Nur die Nachtigall schwieg, nur von dem Mutterbusch
Riß des Boreas Fittig
Jedes blühende Kind herab.

33 Willig nahm sie der Bach freute der Bürde sich
Wallte schneller als sonst, nicht wie das Silber weis
Sondern roth von den Rosen
Die sein spielender Rücken trug.

37 Wo mein Aug' es nicht sah, schwammen die Blüthen hin
Wo kein Schäfer geweint, buhlende Winde nicht
Treue Seufzer verwehen
Die ein liebendes Mädchen seufzt.

41 Ach da traf der Gedank, mich, wie ein Flammenbliz
Daß du Laura auch seyst, gleich einem Rosenbusch
Von der Blüthe der Jugend
Und dem Reize der Rosen schön.

45 'Himmel! soll ein Orkan, diese Rosen verwehn?
Soll ein grausamer Sturm, unerbittlich für mich
Diese Lilien tödten?
Reißt dich Laura das Schicksal fort?'

49 Dieses dacht ich, und sank, Laura, in deinen Arm
Ganz vor Traurigkeit stumm...Doch ich ermannte mich
Einen edeln Gedanken
Dacht ich, Laura! und sprach zu dir.

53 'Liebe, Freundinn, mich stets! Liebe von Tugend beseelt.
Liebe deinen Petrarch! Dann wird im Alter als Freund
Der dich lieben, der ehmals
Als ein Jüngling um dich geweint.

57 Dann komm stürmscher Orkan! raube den Wangen nur
Diese Rosen! Ja, komm! Willig o Sturm kannst du
Diese Lilien tödten!
Denn ich liebe der Laura Herz

45 Zu der Schäferinn Schooß senkte die Blüthe sich,
Zu der Blume der Flur schwebete jede hin.—
Wie, im prächtigen Regen,
Sie mit inniger Demuth saß!—

49 Auf das leichte Gewand flatterte der Jasmin;
Ihres goldenen Haars seidenen Lockenschmuck
Wählten duftende Blätter
Kaum entknospeter Rosen sich.

53 Andre deckten das Gras, andre des Bachs Krystall:
'Liebe herrscht hier im Hain!' flüsterten einige
In den kreiselnden Irren,
Bis der Wirbel des Bachs sie nahm.

57 Zärtlich lächelte da meiner Empfindung Blick,
Doch er trübte sich schnell: ist Sie nicht auch, dacht' ich,
Eine Blume des Tages,
Von dem Reize der Jugend schön?—

61 Wenn ein Nachtsturm nur braust, welket die Blume hin.—
'Ach! Soll denn ein Orkan unter den Rosen wehn?
Diese Lilien tödten?
Reißt dich, Freundinn, das Schicksal fort?'

65 Sagt's und senkte das Haupt traurig in ihren Arm,
Doch ermannt' ich mich gleich, dachte, mit edlem Flug,
Einen hohen Gedanken,
Dacht' ihn ernstvoll, und sprach zu Ihr:

69 'Freundinn, liebe mich stets! Reinere Liebe blüht,
Deckt auch silberner Reif unsere Scheitel einst;
Wenn die Hülle veraltert
Lebt der göttliche Funke noch.

73 Komm denn! Wüte nur her! Raube den Wangen nur
Diese Rosen! Ja komm! Mögen sie doch, o Sturm,
Diese Lilien welken!—
Nicht verschimmernde Stralen nur,

61 Nicht den Schimmer allein...Sprich
o Geliebte, sprich!
Ist nicht im Alter dann, wenn die
Schönheit verwelkt
Dieser Schattenwald Tempe?
Dieses Thal uns Elysium?

65 Reißt die tödtende Zeit, dich mir o
Freundinn weg
Oder muß ich vor dir, nach dem
Olymp hinauf
O so weine nicht Laura
Deinem zärtlichen Freunde nach!

69 Denn Allvater nimmt uns, wenn der
Tod uns vereint
Auf im strahlenden Hain, dann wird
uns wieder einmal
Dieser Schattenwald Tempe,
Diese Thäler Elysium.'

77 Nein, der Tugenden Glanz, welcher
dich, Laura, schmückt,
Flammt zur Liebe mein Herz! Auch
in dem Alter bleibt
Dieser Wald uns noch Tempe,
Dieses Hainthal Elysium.

81 Raubt die tödtende Zeit, meine
Geliebteste—
Nein! Nein! Muß ich von dir nach
dem Olymp hinauf,
O, so weine nicht, Laura,
Deinem scheidenden Freunde
nach!

85 Die du himmlisch hier warst, himm-
lischer wirst du einst
Mir, im Thale des Lichts, nimmt uns
der Vater auf,
Dort im besseren Tempe,
Dort im bessren Elysium!'—

Cramers ursprüngliches Gedicht, wie es in A vorliegt, enthält zwar einige vage Erinnerungen an die Gedankenwelt Petrarcas, aber im übrigen ist es nach Form und Inhalt kein 'petrarchisches Lied,' sondern eine Ode im Stil Klopstocks, wie das von dem jugendlichen Cramer nicht anders zu erwarten war. Das Versmass, eine asklepiadeische Strophe nach Horaz (*Oden*, 1, 5 u.ö.), das Klopstock zwischen 1748 und 1752 mehrmals angewandt hatte[1], war dem jungen Cramer allerdings noch nicht in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen: nicht weniger als vierzehn Verse fügen sich dem Metrum nicht[2]; sie sind sämtlich in B beseitigt oder verbessert. Aber in die Sprache und Darstellungsweise und in das Denken und Empfinden der Klopstockischen Jugendlyrik hatte er sich vollständig eingelebt. Von den charakteristischen Anklängen an diese sind dann einige in der Göttinger Fassung verschwunden: A 10 bis 12 der rötliche Strahl am traubenbeladenen Berg (vgl. 'Der Zürchersee' 5 ff. und 15 f., M.-P. 1, 83), A 14 die zärtliche Braut (vgl. 'Die Braut' 5, M.-P. 1, 80), A 41 der Gedanke, der den Dichter wie ein Flammenblitz trifft, (vgl. 'Ode an den Herrn Ebert' 19 bis 30, M.-P. 1, 38 und 40). Andere hingegen erscheinen in B pointierter als in A. Die Anlehnung an 'Die Braut' 44 (M.-P. 1, 81) ist in B 77 deutlicher als in A 60. 'Selmar und Selma' (M.-P. 1, 58) schwebte Cramer bei der vorletzten Strophe seines Gedichtes vor. In B ist diese nicht nur logisch gebessert; die ganze Situation und

[1] Vgl. Klopstock an J. A. Cramer, 4. Juli 1748. Lappenberg S. 5. Muncker-Pawel, *Klopstocks Oden*, 1, 52, 79, 83, 91, 93, 94, 102, 107.
[2] A 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 45, 46, 53, 54, 62, 69, 70.

Stimmung der Klopstockischen Elegie tritt bei dem 'Nein! Nein!' vors Auge. B 82 *von* ist wohl ein Druckfehler des Musenalmanachs und aus A 66 in *vor* zu verbessern. Als besonderen Schmuck hat der jugendliche Klopstockverehrer die Schlusszeilen der Ode 'Der Zürchersee' in ihrer älteren Fassung (M.-P. I, 85) dreimal in seine Ode verwoben. In A 19 f. fügen sie sich zwanglos ein; in A 63 f. schon weniger gut: hier hat B 78 eine glücklichere Überleitung geschaffen; in A 71 f. aber passen sie am allerwenigsten, und erst ihre Parodie in B 87 f. führte zu einem 'bessern Tempe' und einem 'bessern Elysium.' Der poetischen Mode der Zeit[1] huldigte Cramer, indem er A 21 f. den Rosenbaum, der sich in der Flut sieht, (vgl. [Bardale] älteste Form 45 f., M.-P. I, 54, Cramer *Klopstock. Er; und über ihn* las 'Rosenbusch,' wie auch A 30 und 42) in eine Laube von Jasmin und Rosen verwandelte (B 33 ff.).

Durch zwei Erweiterungen—am Anfang und in der Mitte—ist die Ode in der Göttinger Fassung um vier Strophen vermehrt worden. Der Eingang musste geändert werden, denn A 5 'sassen im Schimmer des Monds' und A 13 ff. 'Und von Osten auf stieg...Cynthia!' konnten nicht nebeneinander stehen bleiben, und das Meer mochte wohl aus A 27 in B 38 hinübergenommen werden, wo es in einiger Entfernung gedacht war, wie es der Lage von Vaucluse bei Avignon entspricht, aber es gehörte nicht in das engere Landschaftsbild am Anfang des Gedichtes (A 9). Cramer hat sich nun nicht damit begnügt, die beiden Eingangsstrophen von A metrisch und inhaltlich zu verbessern, sondern er hat sie durch fünf neue Strophen ersetzt, deren Phraseologie von Anfang bis zu Ende aus Klopstockischen Oden stammt, aber aus anderen als den in A nachgeahmten. A verrät nur Kenntnis solcher Oden, die unmittelbar nach ihrer Entstehung in der *Sammlung Vermischter Schriften, von den Verfassern der Bremischen neuen Beyträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes,* Leipzig 1748—1757, gedruckt worden waren. Dahingegen sind die an die Stelle von A 1 bis 8 getretenen neuen Verse B 1 bis 20 der begeisterte Widerhall der Darmstädter und Hamburger Ausgaben der Oden Klopstocks. In der Darmstädter Sammlung allein erschien im Frühjahr 1771 'Petrarka und Laura' (M.-P. I, 48. Vgl. 3 f., 29 ff., 47 f. mit B 1 bis 4; 61 mit B 15 bis 18). Die Hamburger Ausgabe brachte im Herbst desselben Jahres 'Aganippe und Phiala' (M.-P. I, 158. Vgl. 19 mit B 19 f.) und 'Thuiskon' (M.-P. I, 171. S. bes. 1 bis 8).

[1] Vgl. L. Krähe, *Carl Friedrich Cramer bis zu seiner Amtsenthebung* (*Palaestra*, 44), Berlin 1907, S. 35, Anm. 2 und Anhang.

Die uns vorliegende ältere Fassung der Petrarcaode Cramers ist demnach entstanden vor dem Bekanntwerden der im Frühjahr 1771 erschienenen Darmstädter Sammlung Klopstockischer Oden.

Inhaltlich bedeutender als die neuen Eingangsstrophen ist die Änderung und Erweiterung, die die Ode in der Mitte erfahren hat: an die Stelle der Verse A 33 bis 40, wo der Wind die Blüten in den Bach weht, der sie hinwegträgt, und der Dichter ihnen im Geiste folgt, wie sie davonschwimmen, ist die Schilderung der Geliebten im Blütenregen getreten (B 45 bis 56) im engsten Anschluss an die vierte Strophe der Kanzone Petrarcas 'Chiare, fresche e dolci acque':

Da' be' rami scendea
(Dolce nella memoria)
Una pioggia di fior' sovra 'l suo grembo:
Ed ella si sedea
Umile in tanta gloria,
Coverta già de l' amoroso nembo.
Qual fior cadea sul lembo,
Qual su le trecce bionde,
Ch' oro forbito e perle
Eran quel dí a vederle;
Qual si posava in terra, e qual su l' onde;
Qual, con un vago errore
Girando, parea dir: Qui regna Amore.

Während Klamer Schmidt in seiner ebenfalls 1772 erschienenen Phantasie 'An die Quelle zu Vaucluse[1]' nur aus Meinhards[2] Übersetzung schöpfte[3] und deshalb, wie diese, den Vers *Qual si posava in terra e qual su l' onde* ausliess, legte Cramer den vollständigen Text des Originals zugrunde. Aus dem zweiten Vers machte er die neue Überschrift und das Motto von B. Wenn A die Fassung des Gedichtes ist, die Cramer 1772 nach Göttingen mitbrachte, dann hat erst der Herausgeber des Musenalmanachs den jungen Mitarbeiter zu dieser direkteren Anlehnung an Petrarca vermocht. Solche Nachahmung eines fremden Musters war durchaus im Sinne Boies, dessen poetische Erzeugnisse meist Übertragungen aus dem Französischen und Englischen sind[4]. 'Das arme Crämerlein' aber ward als verunglückter Nachahmer Petrarcas von einem zeitgenössischen Kritiker 'gezwiebelt' und 'gewurstelt'[5].

[1] *Phantasien nach Petrarka's Manier*, von Klamer Eberhard Karl Schmidt, Halberstadt und Lemgo 1772, S. 35 bis 43.

[2] Joh. Nic. Meinhard, *Versuche über den Charakter und die Werke der besten Italiänischen Dichter*, Braunschweig 1763—64. (In der neuen Auflage, Braunschweig 1774, Erster Teil, S. 198—202.)

[3] Vgl. Feigel, *Vom Wesen der Anakreontik*, Cassel 1909, S. 77.

[4] Vgl. Weinhold, *H. Chr. Boie*, S. 240 Anm. 2, S. 278 und die Quellennachweise zu Boies Gedichten, S. 287 ff.

[5] Im *Deutschen Merkur*, Februar 1773, S. 167 bis 170. Vgl. Bürger an Boie, Strodtmann 1, 105, und Cramer an Bürger, ebenda 118.

In der letzten Strophe der Ode ist der aus Gerstenberg[1] übernommene Allvater im Hain (A 69 f.) in den himmlischen Vater (B 86) verwandelt und dadurch der Missklang des Skaldentons im Petrarcaliede beseitigt worden. Mit starken Entlehnungen aus Gerstenbergs Schilderung der badenden Göttin Blakullur hat Cramer in einer anderen Petrarcaode, auf die er in A 23 f. anspielt, Laura im Bade besungen. In der nächsten Nummer dieser Zeitschrift hoffe ich diese Ode nebst anderen Jugenddichtungen Cramers mitzuteilen.

Julius Freund.

Sheffield.

[1] *Gedicht eines Skalden*, s. Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts, 29/30, Stuttgart, 1890, S. 360.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

The Old English 'Genesis,' ll. 1145 and 1446—8.

> Him æfter heold, þa he of worulde gewat,
> Enos yrfe, siððan eorðe swealh
> sædberendes Sethes lice. (*Genesis*, ll. 1143—5.)

'Sædberende' is ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in Old English poetry. Grein's explanation is: 'incrementum (in deo) ferens, gottesfürchtig?...vgl. 'godsæd,' und *H. Z.* x, 356[1].' Dietrich, in *Haupt's Zeitschrift*, x, 355, 356, explains 'godsæd' in the passage, *Daniel*, ll. 88—90:

> Þa hie þær fundon to freagleawe,
> æðele cnihtas & æfæste,
> ginge & gode in godsæde,

as meaning 'gotteswachstum, gottesfurcht,' which interpretation Grein follows in his *Sprachschatz*.

It is difficult to see how 'godsæd' in the sense of 'gottesfurcht' can establish 'gottesfürchtig' as the meaning of 'sædberende.' Owing to the presence of the element 'god' in the one case, and its absence in the other, there is no safe path from the first to the second. The difficulty is increased by the fact that, in the only other case in which the dictionaries record its appearance, 'sædberende' is used in a literal, not a figurative, sense. Aelfric's *Genesis*, i, 29, has 'eall gærs and wyrta sæd berende ofer eorðan,' translating the Latin 'omnem herbam afferentem semen super terram[2].' And even if 'gottesfürchtig' should be accepted as a *possible* meaning of the word, it would by no means follow that it was the true meaning in this passage. For if it means no more than this, it would be appropriate, not to Seth merely, but to any of the patriarchs dealt with in the poem, from Adam to Abraham. Why then is it applied only to Seth? Why is it used nowhere else in Old English poetry, of any one of the numerous persons for whom

[1] Grein, *Sprachschatz*, II, 394 f.

[2] *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*, I, 27. The editor prints 'sæd berende, as two words, but it seems rather to be a compound, as Bosworth-Toller, *s.v.*, prints it.

'godfearing' would be an appropriate epithet? These considerations make it probable that 'sædberende' in this passage is used in a literal sense, and that it is applied to Seth as an individual, not merely as a good man. To establish this, we must show why the epithet should be applied to him and not to other persons. Is there anything in Seth's history that would make 'sædberende' an appropriate epithet for him?

In Scripture, of course, there is nothing to suggest such a description[1], but in the well-known legend of the Holy Cross before the time of Christ, Seth *is* a seed-bearer. The story is most conveniently cited in the Latin text first made completely accessible by Wilhelm Meyer in 1882[2], which will hereafter be briefly referred to as the *Legend*. When Adam at the age of 932 years grew sorrowful and weary of life, he sent Seth to Paradise to inquire of the Cherub in regard to the oil of mercy that God had promised. Seth at the command of the Cherub looks in at the gate and sees the tree which was the occasion of his parents' sin, and in the summit of the tree a newborn child wrapt in swaddling clothes. This Child, said the Cherub, is the oil of mercy promised to Seth's parents. Then, continues the *Legend*:

> Seth ita edoctus ab angelo cum uellet discedere, dedit ei angelus tria grana pomi illius, de quo manducauerat pater eius dicens ei: Infra triduum cum ad patrem tuum redieris ipse exspirabit. haec tria grana infra eius linguam pones, de quibus surgent tres uirgulae arborum. una arbor erit cedrus, alia cypressus, tertia pinus...Regressus vero Seth prospero cursu uenit ad patrem...obiit autem Adam infra triduum, sicut predictum est ab angelo. Quem Seth sepeliuit in ualle Ebron et grana iam dicta sub lingua in os eius posuit. ex quibus tres uirgulae in breui surrexerunt unius ulnae longitudinem habentes. In ore Adae steterunt uirgulae illae ab Adam usque ad Noe, a Noe usque ad Abraham, ab Abraham usque ad Moysen, numquam crescentes numquam uiriditatem amittentes[3].

That this story was in existence early enough to be known to the author of the *Genesis* cannot be proved, for the earliest extant version of the *Legend* dates from about the end of the thirteenth century[4]. It is well known, however, that this part of the *Legend*, the history of the Cross-wood from Adam to Moses, is merely a variant of the *Vita Adae*

[1] It might seem at first sight possible to get from 'sædberende' some such meaning as 'transmitter of life from one generation to the other.' But if this were a possible meaning it would be open to the same objection as the interpretation 'gottesfürchtig,' for it has no special applicability to Seth. He was only one among many sons begotten by Adam after Cain and Abel: 'Et facti sunt dies Adam, postquam genuit Seth, octingenti anni: genuitque filios et filias,' Gen. v, 4. Cf. *Genesis*, ll. 1121—4.

[2] *Die Geschichte des Kreuzholzes vor Christus, Abhandlungen der philos.-philol. Klasse der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Band xvi, Abteil. 2, München, 1882. The text of the *Legend* proper occupies pp. 131—149.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 137 f.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

et Evae, a document which is perhaps as early as the fourth century[1]. The chief difference from our point of view is that in the *Vita*, Seth, when sent to the gate of Paradise by the dying Adam, receives from the angel, not 'tria grana,' but 'odoramenta hoc est nardum et crocum et calaminthen et cinamomum[2].' Considering the fact that we have in English a highly developed form of the history of the Cross-wood (from Moses to St Helena), translated from a Latin original in either the eleventh or the twelfth century[3], there is no improbability in supposing that some form of a history of the Cross before Christ was current three or four centuries earlier. As soon as such a legend did become current it would almost inevitably attach itself to and modify for its own end the already existing *Vita*. The two legends seem made for each other. These considerations justify us in holding that the author of the *Genesis* may well have known and alluded to some story of Seth journeying to Paradise and bringing away seeds from the forbidden tree. This possibility being granted, such an allusion seems to me the most probable explanation yet proposed for *Genesis*, l. 1145.

> Him seo wen geleah;
> ac se feond gespearn fleotende hreaw:
> salwigfeðera secan nolde. (*Genesis*, ll. 1446—8.)

In this passage, a part of the account of Noah's sending the raven out of the ark to find land, the word 'feond' causes difficulty. Thorpe translates it as 'exulting'; Grein as 'freudig'; in his *Bibliothek* Grein queries 'feonde?' in his note, glossing it under 'feohan,' 'gaudere, laetari' in the *Sprachschatz*. Bouterwek, however, in his glossary gives

[1] Also edited by Wilhelm Meyer, *Abhandlungen der philos.-philol. Klasse der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Band XIV, Abteil. 3, München, 1878; on the date of the Latin *Vita* see Meyer's introduction.

[2] Meyer, *Vita*, p. 236. The *Vita* and the *Legend* do not, of course, agree exactly in incidents. In the former Eve accompanies Seth on his journey, in the latter she does not, etc. But the situation of Adam and the main outlines of the two narratives are the same. It is of interest to note that some form of the *Vita* was probably used by the original author of the material contained in *Genesis B*. See F. N. Robinson, *A Note on the Sources of the Old Saxon Genesis*, in *Modern Philology*, IV, 389 ff.

[3] Edited by Napier, *History of the Holy Rood-Tree*, E. E. T. S., 1894. The MS. is of the twelfth century. For the editor's argument in favour of regarding the text as a copy of an eleventh century Old English version, see the Introduction, pp. lviii, lix. According to Napier's theory of the genesis of this material, the texts of the *Rood-Tree* group are derived from a common original, *X*; and *X* and the *Legend* (or rather the features common to the two) have a common source. His theory differs considerably from Meyer's, because Meyer did not know this text, the earliest complete document that has been preserved. 'This important fact,' says Napier, 'that a fully developed Cross-legend, treating the history of the Cross-wood from Moses to Christ, existed in the first half of the twelfth century, perhaps early in the eleventh—in point of time, as early as, or earlier than, Meyer's first and simplest stages—will have to be taken into account by future reconstructors of the history and development of the Cross-wood legend.' *Ibid.*, p. xli.

it the ordinary meaning, 'hostis, inimicus.' The former of these interpretations is highly uncertain; 'feond' as a participial noun corresponding to 'feohan' does not occur, and to emend to *feonde* is undesirable. It seems best then to take the word in the latter sense, if we can do so. Can we find any explanation for the poet's regarding the raven as 'the enemy,' or 'the hateful one'? The following legend from Dr Louis Ginzberg's recently published *Legends of the Jews* does seem to afford an intelligible explanation:

> Noah had experienced difficulty all along in ascertaining the state of the waters. When he desired to dispatch the raven, the bird said: '*The Lord, thy Master, hates me, and thou dost hate me, too. Thy Master hates me*, for He bade thee take seven pairs of the clean animals into the ark, and but two pairs of the unclean animals, to which I belong. *Thou hatest me*, for thou dost not choose, as a messenger, a bird of one of the kinds of which there are seven pairs in the ark, but thou sendest me, and of my kind there is but one pair. Suppose, now, I should perish by reason of heat or cold, would not the world be the poorer by a whole species of animals? Or can it be that thou hast cast a lustful eye upon my mate, and desirest to rid thyself of me?' Whereunto Noah made answer, and said: 'Wretch! I must live apart from my own wife in the ark. How much less would such thoughts occur to my mind as thou imputest to me!'
>
> The raven's errand had no success, for when he saw the body of a dead man, he set to work to devour it, and did not execute the orders given to him by Noah[1].

Dr Ginzberg has courteously informed me that the material of the first paragraph just quoted is contained in *Talmud Sanhedrin* 108[b] and that the material of the second, of which I give only a part, is from *Pirke Rabbi Elieser*, Chap. XXIII. I am informed by Professor George F. Moore of Harvard University that the former piece of material is derived, according to the *Talmud* reference, from Rabbi Simeon ben Lakish, c. 250 A.D. The *Pirke Elieser*, he tells me, is a hagadic work of the first half of the ninth century, containing a great deal of older material[2]. If, therefore, my explanation of the occurrence of the epithet 'feond' in this context commend itself to the judgment of scholars, no chronological difficulties are in the way of its acceptance.

SAMUEL MOORE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

[1] *Legends of the Jews*, Phila., 1909, I, 163, 164. The italics are mine. Of this work two volumes have already appeared. The notes and account of sources will be contained in vol. IV.

[2] This particular piece of material is certainly older than the ninth century, for it occurs in Isidorus Hispalensis, of the seventh century: 'Quod post dies quadraginta emissus corvus non est reversus, aut aquis utique interceptus, aut aliquo supernante cadavere illectus, significat,' etc. *Quaestiones in Genesin*, Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, LXXXIII, 233; cited by Hönncher, *Über die Quellen der angelsächsischen Genesis*, in *Anglia*, VIII, 64.

A Note on Spenser's 'Amoretti.'

In the *Modern Language Review*, July, 1910, p. 273, Mr J. C. Smith rests some part of his argument on Spenser's description of his love's person in 'Ye tradefull merchants, that with weary toile,' etc. (*Amoretti*, xv). Apparently Mr Smith has not noticed this sonnet of Philippe Desportes (*Diane*, I, xxxii):

> Marchands, qui recherchez tout le rivage more
> Du froid septentrion, et qui, sans reposer,
> A cent mille dangers vous allez exposer,
> Pour un gain incertain, qui vos esprits devore,
> Venez seulement voir la beauté que j'adore,
> Et par quelle richesse elle a sçeu m'attiser;
> Et je suis seur qu'apres vous ne pourrez priser
> Le plus rare tresor dont l'Afrique se dore.
> Voyez les filets d'or de ce chef blondissant,
> L'eclat de ces rubis, ce coral rougissant,
> Ce cristal, cet ebene, et ces graces divines,
> Cet argent, cet yvoire; et ne vous contentez
> Qu'on ne vous montre encor mille autres raretez,
> Mille beaux diamans et mille perles fines.

Barnabe Barnes, *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*, xlviii, also uses this sonnet. I think it is clear from this that Spenser (if he wrote all the *Amoretti*) is one more of those who 'filch from Portes'!

H. Littledale.

Cardiff.

Ambassador La Boderie and the 'Compositeur' of the Byron Plays.

In his interesting article on *Court Performances under James the First*[1] Mr E. K. Chambers gives curious particulars on the incident which nearly cost Chapman his liberty, and on the intervention of the French Ambassador, Antoine Lefèvre de la Boderie, who wanted both the 'compositeur' of the *Conspiracy...of Byron* and the comedians to be committed to jail. Mr Chambers quotes the ambassador's dispatch of 8 April, 1608, from the text printed in the *Ambassades de Monsieur de la Boderie*, 1750, besides referring the reader to the original text in MS. Fr. 15984 at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

Happening recently to be in Paris, I made a copy of the original and, as the printed text is far from faultless (giving for example 'leur

[1] *Modern Language Review*, Vol. iv, p. 158 (Jan. 1909).

en ordonner la permission,' which means nothing, instead of 'leur en redonner'), the readers of the *Modern Language Review* many find some interest in having before them the text of the dispatch as signed by the Ambassador concerning the Chapman incident. It will be remembered that the letter is directed to Mr de Puisieux (Pierre Brulart de Puisieux, marquis de Sillery), then Secretary of State, and that its author was a man of parts, belonging to a literary family, two brothers of his being famous as orientalists, one of them, Guy, being moreover a poet and the author of a prologue for Jodelle's *Cleopatra*.

Here is the extract; a passage was in cipher in the original; it is printed here in italics:

Environ la micaresme ces certains comédiens à qui j'avois fait deffendre de jouer l'histoire du feu mareschal de Biron, voyant toutte la cour dehors, ne laissèrent de le faire, et non seulement cela, mais y introduisirent la Royne et Madame de Verneuil, la première traitant celle-cy fort mal de paroles, et luy donnant un soufflet. En ayant eu advis de-là à quelques jours, aussi-tost je m'en allay trouver le Comte de Salsbury et luy fis plainte de ce que non seulement ces compaignons-là contrevenoient à la deffense qui leur avoit esté faicte, mais y adjoustoient des choses non seulement plus importantes, mais qui n'avoient que faire avec le mareschal de Biron, et au partir de-là estoient toutes faulses, dont en vérité il se montra fort courroucé. Et dès l'heure mesme envoya pour les prendre. Toutteffois il ne s'en trouva que trois, qui aussi-tost furent menez en la prison où ilz sont encore; mais le principal qui est le compositeur eschapa. Un jour ou deux devant, ilz avoient dépêché leur Roy, sa mine d'Escosse et tous ses Favorits d'une estrange sorte; *car apres luy avoir fait dépiter le ciel sur le vol d'un oyseau, et faict battre un gentilhomme pour avoir rompu ses chiens, ilz le dépeignoient ivre pour le moins une fois le jour. Ce qu'ayant sçu, je pensay qu'il seroit assez en colère contre lesdits commédiens, sans que je l'y misse davantage, et qu'il valoit mieux référer leur châtiment à l'irrévérence qu'ilz lui avoient portée, qu'à ce qu'ilz pourroient avoir dit desdites Dames,* et pour ce, je me résolus de n'en plus parler, mais considérer ce qu'ilz firent. Quand ledit Sieur Roy a esté icy, il a tesmoigné estre extrèmement irrité contre ces maraults-là, et a commandé qu'ilz soient chastiez et surtout qu'on eust à faire diligence de trouver le compositeur. Mesme il a fait deffense que l'on n'eust plus à jouer de Comédies dedans Londres, pour lever laquelle deffense quatre autres compagnies qui y sont encore, offrent desja cent mille francs, lesquels pourront bien leur en redonner la permission; mais pour le moins sera-ce à condition qu'ilz ne représenteront plus aucune histoire moderne ni ne parleront des choses du temps à peine de la vie. Si j'eusse creu qu'il y eust eu de la suggestion en ce qu'avoient dit lesdits comédiens, j'en eusse fait du bruit davantage; mais ayant tout subjet d'estimer le contraire, j'ay pensay que le meilleur estoit de ne point le remuer davantage, et laisser audit Roy la vengeance de son fait mesme. Touttefois si vous jugez delà, Monsieur, que je n'y aye fait assez, il est encore temps.

The first words of this passage: 'ces certains comédiens' (instead of 'des comédiens,' as in the printed text), clearly imply that the Ambassador had already written about them. I failed to discover La Boderie's other letter, perhaps because it has not been preserved, as we find more than once in his correspondence allusions to dispatches which we have no more; perhaps because, for lack of time, I could not make a thorough search.

All I can add (and being away, I now quote from the printed edition) is the answer of Mr de Puisieux who, in a letter of 25 April, 1608, after having informed the Ambassador of 'l'heureux accouchement de la Reine d'un beau fils, sur les 9 heures du matin' (the notorious Gaston d'Orléans), tells his correspondent that he did well and need not take more trouble about the comedians and their 'insolence':

> Vous avez bien fait de vous moquer de l'insolence de ces Comédiens, avec la mesure que vous y avez tenu, puisque le Roi de la Grande Bretagne n'y a pas été en plus grande considération. Vous n'en devez pas faire plus grand ressentiment, encore, je vous assure, qu'on ait trouvé de deçà cette procédure bien audacieuse[1].

La Boderie answers Puisieux on the 7th of May without alluding to the comedians, the comedy, or the 'compositeur' thereof: for him was *finita la commedia*.

J. J. Jusserand.

Washington.

Notes on 'The Two Noble Kinsmen.'

> Raise me a devill now, and let him play
> *Quipassa* o' th bels and bones.
>
> III, 5. ll. 97, 98.

'Quipassa' is not explained in *The Shakespeare Apocrypha*, edited by C. F. Tucker Brooke. Littledale, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, I, 147, calls it 'an unexplained line.' In C. H. Herford's edition (Temple dramatists) there is the following note on p. 148: *Qui passa*: 'here passes'; but the point is unexplained. 'Qui passa' is the name of a dance tune, variously spelt 'Que passa,' 'qui pascie,' and even 'kypascie.' In Clement Robinson's *A Handfull of pleasant delites*, 1584 (Arber's Reprints, p. 46), there is 'A sonet of two faithfull Louers, exhorting one another to be constant. To the tune of Kypascie.' In Joseph Lilly's *Seventy-nine Black-Letter Ballads* (London, 1867) there is on p. 138 'A proper newe Ballad sheweing that philosophers learnynges are full of good warnynges. And songe to the tune of my Lorde Marques Galyarde, or the first traces of Que passa.' From this it appears that it belonged to the galiards.

In IV, 1. 142 the Jailer's Daughter sings 'O faire, oh sweete, etc.' This is the first line of Song VIII in the first volume of Grosart's edition of Sir Philip Sidney's *Complete Poems*, p. 200, to the tune of 'Se tu

[1] *Ambassades de Monsieur de la Boderie en Angleterre*, Paris, 1750, Vol. III, p. 233.

señora no dueles de mi.' Cp. Littledale, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, I, 152. In ll. 133, 134 she says: 'I can sing the Broome, And Bony Robin.' For 'Bony Robin' Herford refers the reader to *Hamlet* IV, 5. 187. The reader will find the tune and many details in Chappell's *Old English Popular Music*, 1893, Vol. I, pp. 153—4. It is mentioned in the *Roxburgh Ballads* I, 241 (edition of 1869), and the music is given in *Het Luitboek van Thysius*, edited by Land, Nr 76. The song usually goes by the name of 'Bonny sweet Robin' or of 'My Robin is to the Greenwood gone.'

For an account of the somewhat complicated history of 'Brome, Brome on hill,' 'The Broom of Cowdenknows,' and 'The Broom blooms bonnie and so is it fair,' I refer the curious reader to Chappell, *Old English Popular Music*, edition of 1859, Vol. II, 458—461, Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, Nos. 15^{b}, $16^{a, e}$, and 217, and to *Robert Laneham's Letter*, edited by F. J. Furnivall, 1907, pp. cxxvii—cxxix. That the tune long retained its popularity is evident from the fact that the eighteenth air of the first act of *The Beggar's Opera* is written to the melody of 'O the Broom, etc.,' and that to this day the song 'set to several different airs, has been picked up traditionally in Devonshire, Yorkshire, Northumberland, and Norfolk' (*The Minstrelsy of England*, edited by Alfred Moffat, Notes by Frank Kidson, 1901, p. 234).

A. E. H. Swaen.

Groningen.

'L'Allegro' and 'The Passionate Shepheard.'

It is perhaps a trifle daring—in view of the minute and sustained scrutiny to which Milton's minor poems have been subjected—to suggest that one source of the inspiration of at least a portion of *L'Allegro* has been overlooked. But that seems pretty certainly to be the case.

In Nicholas Breton's *The Passionate Shepheard*, published in 1604[1], occur, at the beginning of the third 'passion[2],' the following lines:

[1] *The Works in Verse and Prose of Nicholas Breton*, Chertsey Worthies Library, ed. Grosart, I, xxiii. The exemplar of *The Passionate Shepheard* is unique. See Dr Grosart's prefatory note.

[2] The full title of the book is as follows: The | Passionate | Shepheard, | or | The Shepheardes Loue: set downe in | Passions to his Shepheardesse | Aglaia. | With many excellent conceited Poems and plea | sant Sonnets, fit for young heads to passe away | *idle houres*.

Who can liue in heart so glad,
As the merrie countrie lad?
Who vpon a faire greene balke
May at pleasures sit and walke?
And amidde the Azure skies,
See the morning Sunne arise?
While hee heares in euery spring,
How the Birdes doe chirpe and sing:
Or, before the houndes in crie,
See the Hare goe stealing by:
Or along the shallow brooke,
Angling with a baited hooke:
See the fishes leape and play,
In a blesséd Sunny day:
Or to heare the Partridge call,
Till shee haue her Couye all:
Or to see the subtill foxe,
How the villaine plies the box:
After feeding on his pray,
How he closely sneakes away,
Through the hedge and downe the furrow,
Till he geets into his burrowe.
Then the Bee to gather honey,
And the little blacke-haird Cony,
On a banke for Sunny place,
With her fore-feete wash her face:
Are not these with thousandes moe,
Then the Courts of Kinges doe knowe?[1]

It is not necessary to print here the well-known passage of *L'Allegro* which begins with l. 41. The remarkable thing about Breton's lines, of course, is the way in which they combine with a strikingly similar sequence of ideas the very cadences and even grammatical constructions of a portion of the later poem. Both include the morning walk on the green balke, or on green hillocks, the sight of the rising sun, and the hounds in cry; and both proceed to an enumeration of still other sights and sounds of the furrowed[2] fields. These particular sights and sounds, to be sure, are not identical; but the structural parallel is significantly close. Moreover, Breton's cadences are almost startlingly the cadences of *L'Allegro*. The last ten lines that have

[1] Ed. Grosart, p. 6, col. 2. I have added line numbers for convenience of reference. These lines are singled out for special praise in Dr Grosart's Memorial-Introduction, I, xlvi; and they are also quoted, with recognition of their 'peculiar grace' by Edmund Gosse, in his Essay on English Pastoral Poetry, prefixed to the third volume of the Grosart *Spenser*, p. xxix. Mr Gosse's characterization of the four 'passions' with which *The Passionate Shepheard* begins (to the third of which the lines just quoted belong) is worth repeating here: 'The "passions" are written in octosyllabic verse, so fresh and light and leaping, that the sound of them is like the babble of a rivulet descending a sunny meadow.' And he proceeds to speak of 'the knowledge of English landscape displayed, the gracious unaffected manner of its presentment, and the joyous laughing air of the speaker' (p. xxix).

[2] Compare *L'Allegro*, l. 64, *P. S.*, l. 21.

been quoted, especially, might slip in anywhere between lines 41 and 68 of *L'Allegro* (for example) with scarcely an appreciable break in the rhythm—or, for that matter, in the sense. It would be easy to point out specific parallels, both for single verses[1] and (even more notably) for similar sequences of rhythms[2]. But since the measures of *L'Allegro* are part and parcel of everybody's metrical subconsciousness, the final test is after all simply to read aloud Breton's lines.

Even the grammatical constructions of the two passages are curiously similar. Both are extremely free in their use of infinitives; and the famous 'Then to come' of *L'Allegro* (l. 45) finds its parallel in the equally suspended 'Then...to gather' (l. 23) of the pastoral—not to speak of 'Or to heare' of l. 15. Indeed, the similarity of rhythm already noted arises in many instances from the similarity of sentence structure—from the parallel use, in particular, of initial 'while,' 'till,' 'then,' 'how,' and 'or.' Once more, however, close reading is a more effective test than mechanical analysis.

If we turn now to the preceding 'passion' (*Past.* 2), it is only necessary to read a few lines to see that we are dealing with a *context* also that is not without significance:

> *Come abroad* you blessed Muses,
> Yee that Pallas chiefly choses,
> When shee would commend a creature,
> In the honour of loues nature...
> *Haste yee* therefore, come away...
> *Call the siluan Nimphes together,*
> *Bid them bring* their musickes hither...
> So with all your sweetest powers,
> Entertaine her in your bowers[3].

Compare the familiar invocation to Mirth:

> *But com* thou Goddes fair and free,
> In Heav'n ycleapt Euphrosyne...
> *Haste thee Nymph, and bring with thee*
> Jest, and youthful Jollity...
> And in thy right hand lead with thee,
> *The Mountain Nymph,* sweet Liberty;
> And, if I give thee honour due,
> Mirth, admit me of thy crue,
> To live with her, and live with thee[4],
> In unreproved pleasures free.

[1] Compare, for an example which involves a line farther on in *L'Allegro*, l. 14 above—'In a blessed Sunny day'—with *L'Allegro*, 98, 'On a Sunshine Holyday.'
[2] Compare, for instance, *L'Allegro*, ll. 45, 46, and *P. S.*, ll. 21, 22.
[3] *P. S.*, p. 6, col. 1.
[4] *L'Allegro*, ll. 11 f., 25 f., 35—40.

Moreover, the *succeeding* context has its interest. The third 'passion,' which begins with the descriptive lines in question, ends as follows:

> *So might I but liue to bee,*
> *Where I might but sit to see,*
> Once a day, or all day long,
> The sweet subiect of my song:
> In *Aglaiae's* onely eyes,
> All my worldly paradise[1].

Compare, this time, not only the close of *L'Allegro*—

> These delights, if thou canst give,
> Mirth with thee, I mean to *live*—

but also that of *Il Penseroso*:

> *Where I may sit* and rightly spell...
> These pleasures Melancholy give,
> And I with thee will choose to *live*.

In a word, it is obvious that the descriptive lines under consideration occur in a *setting* which also offers manifest parallels with the setting of the corresponding passage in *L'Allegro*[2].

I do not mean to suggest that in the lines from *The Passionate Shepheard* we have necessarily the *fons et origo* of *L'Allegro*. That would be too large a claim. But it does seem to be entirely clear that Breton's lines, with their authentic freshness and charm, clung to Milton's memory, and that, to a larger degree (it would seem) than any one other influence, they left in *L'Allegro* their stamp upon his own expression. If that be true, our debt to Nicholas Breton is no small one.

John Livingston Lowes.

Saint Louis, U.S.A.

Shakespeare, 'King Lear,' iv, vi, 70—72.

May I be allowed to say that the note on this passage by Mr W. H. Williams was anticipated by me? Whoever will kindly refer to the new edition of my *Etymological Dictionary* issued last year will find at p. 710, s.v. *Whelk* (1), the following note. 'Hence prob. *welked*,

[1] *P. S.*, p. 7, col. 1.

[2] It is interesting to compare with Milton's 'Where more is meant then meets the ear' (*Il Penseroso*, l. 120) Breton's line: 'Dante's *best obscur'd intention*' in the following 'passion' (p. 7, col. 2). But I do not wish to lay too much stress on this—nor on the equally interesting phrasing of a couplet in the second of the so-called 'sonnets' which immediately follow the four 'passions':

> Her necke should seeme a *piller* fit,
> *For to vpholde the state* of wit (p. 11, col. 1).

K. Lear, iv. 6. 71, spelt *wealk'd*, i.e., convoluted, in the first folio; cf. "welked horns" in Golding's Ovid, pp. 60 b, 107 b, 122 b.' Mr Williams refers to only one passage in Golding, the first of these; but the expression occurs at least thrice.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

CAMBRIDGE.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF 'DISMAL.'

As the reviewer of the new edition of my *Etymological Dictionary* in the January number of the *Modern Language Review* especially mentions the etymology of 'dismal' as one of my discoveries, perhaps I may be allowed to mention that the discovery in this case was due to Mr Paget Toynbee, who communicated to me the facts, from an Old French source, nearly twenty years ago. The theory that the derivation of 'dismal' is from O.F. *dis mal*, was offered by me *as a guess* on Nov. 4, 1887, in a paper printed for the Philological Society in 1888 and reprinted in my *Notes on English Etymology*, pp. 69, 70. I explained at that date (1887) Chaucer's use of 'in the dismalle,' and I said that it represented O.F. *dis mal* = Lat. *dies mali*. But I had no proof; and the proof was supplied by Mr Toynbee in 1891, and communicated by me to the *Academy* at that date. When, however, I printed my *Notes* in 1901, ten years later, I had forgotten this fact, and I find, to my deep regret, that I *then* appended a few lines, at p. 70, to this effect. '*Add*—This conjecture turned out to be correct. Shortly afterwards I observed the occurrence of A.F. *dis mal*,' etc. So I did; but it must have been wholly due to the fact that Mr Toynbee supplied the reference. Of course this misled your reviewer. I beg leave to apologise for this oversight, which will, I trust, be ascribed to my forgetfulness. I have received so much assistance from so many kind friends that I fail to remember whence my ideas have come. May I say, once for all, that I claim to be no better than a compiler; and though some of the contributions have come from my own stores, I cannot always say which they are.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Etymology of 'Pun.'

Abraham Cowley's comedy *The Guardian* (acted 1641, and printed 1650) and the revised version of the same play, *Cutter of Coleman-Street* (acted 1661, and printed 1663), perhaps throw some new light upon the date and the original meaning of 'pun' and its derivatives. As the *N.E.D.* informs us, the word 'pun' is of unascertained origin and appeared first shortly after 1660. The first example that it gives us of this word (or of any of its derivatives) is from Dryden and belongs to the year 1662.

'Pun' itself does not occur in either the 1641 or the 1661 version of Cowley's play, but in both versions there is an important character named Puny. In the *dramatis personae* he is 'a young Gallant, a pretender to Wit'; or, as he is described in the second play, 'pretending to extraordinary wit.'

In the revised version of 1661, but not in the original play, there occurs the adjective 'Punish' in describing a kind of wit similar to that of Puny's (this derivative of 'pun' is not found in the *N.E.D.*). Aurelia, the admirer of Puny, uses this word in speaking to Puny's companions, who are imitating his peculiar affectation:

Aurelia: ...well, wretched Lovers, come along with me now, (but softly upon your lives,...)
Cutter: As softly as Snow falls.
Worm: Or Vapors rise.
Aurelia: What are you Punish too with your Similitudes?[1]

Mr Grosart explains this word as meaning 'given to puns or jokes.' But it evidently has a direct reference to Puny, as is shown both by the context and by the fact that it is written with a capital letter. In view of this connection of 'Punish' with Puny, it may be that 'pun,' first recorded in 1662 as used by Dryden, who we know was present at the first performance of *Cutter* in 1661[2], is related to Puny. Downes[3] is authority for the statement that *Cutter of Coleman-Street* was a popular piece, 'being Acted so perfectly well and exact, it was performed a whole week with a full audience'; and Genest tells of subsequent revivals. Cowley, whom Dryden considered the first wit of his day, had certainly prestige enough to popularise a new word, especially where it concerned the characterisation of a kind of wit in fashion.

[1] *Cutter of Coleman-Street*, Act ii, Sc. 5.
[2] Genest, Vol. i, p. 40.
[3] *Roscius Anglicanus*, reprinted 1886, p. 25.

Puny's wit is punning only in the sense of 'hammering at forced similitudes,' according to Professor Skeat's definition. It is not the punning where 'two like words make up one noise[1],' but where the effort is made 'upon all things to obtrude, And force some odd similitude[1].' Cowley's Puny is, furthermore, a 'pretender to wit,' whose witticisms are characterised as 'sottish affectations.' It remains for Aurelia to reveal to us the real character of his wit[2]:

> Here comes...a young rich, fantastical Fop, that would be a Wit, and has got a new way of being so; he scorns to speak anything that's common, and finds out some impertinent similitude for everything.

In the version of twenty years earlier this description is in the mouth of another character, but it rings much the same[3]:

> Yet you forsooth, because you see some Gentlemen and Poets of late, a little extravagant sometimes in their similitudes; because they make a pretty kinde of sound to those that mark 'um not; make that your way of wit, and never speak without comparisons. But never were comparisons so odious as thine are.

Other early examples of the use of 'pun' would assist in determining whether Cowley's character was of influence in the early history of this word.

M. P. Tilley.

Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

The Composition of the Pléiade.

In his excellent edition of Binet's *Vie de Ronsard*, pp. 219—225, M. Laumonier has carefully investigated the question as to who were the seven members of the Pléiade, and his conclusion practically is that the name of Peletier should be substituted for that of Dorat in the traditional and accepted list. As the point is one of considerable interest, I propose to examine his argument in detail. In the first place he agrees with M. Chamard, as against Miss Evers, that from 1549 the word *Brigade* was used as a distinctive term for Ronsard and his poetic school. But as his followers became more and more numerous, he found it necessary to distinguish from the crowd a select band. This, thinks M. Laumonier, he first did in the well-known elegy addressed to Jean Bastier de La Peruse, written in 1553 (*Œuvres*, ed. Blanchemain, VI, 43), in which he mentions the names of Du Bellay, Thiard, Baïf, Des Autels, Jodelle, and La Peruse. The last

[1] Cowley's Ode, *Of Wit*.
[2] *Cutter of Coleman-Street*, Act ii, Sc. 3.
[3] *The Guardian*, Act iv, Sc. 3.

of these died in 1554, and his place, says M. Laumonier, was taken by Belleau. Then in 1555 after the publication of Peletier's *Art poëtique* (June) the latter's name was substituted for that of Des Autels. With this part of M. Laumonier's argument I do not altogether agree. It seems to me that the mention of six names in the elegy to La Peruse is accidental, and that Ronsard's object is merely to mention in chronological order the chief productions of the new poetic school. Further it is unlikely that Ronsard should have sacrificed Des Autels, 'qu'il estimait,' says M. Laumonier, 'd'une façon toute particulière,' for Peletier. Lastly the well-known lines addressed to Belleau in August, 1556,

> qui vins en la brigade
> Des bons pour accomplir la septiesme Pleïade[1];

surely imply that the Pléiade was not completed till the admission of Belleau. In fact this would seem to be the view originally held by M. Laumonier, for in *Ronsard poète lyrique*, p. 110, n. 4, he says that the Pléiade was hardly formed before 1555. Rather, it was not formed at all till this year, and when formed it consisted—here I accept M. Laumonier's view—of Ronsard, Du Bellay, Baïf, Thiard, Jodelle, Peletier and Belleau. The evidence for this M. Laumonier finds in eight lines of the *Hymne de Henri II*[2], which Ronsard afterwards suppressed and which did not reappear till M. Laumonier reprinted them in the *Rev. d'hist. litt.* for April—June, 1905, p. 256:

> Non je ne suis tout seul, non, tout seul je ne suis,
> Non je ne le suis pas qui par mes œuvres puis
> Donner aux grands Seigneurs une gloire éternelle:
> Autres ce peuvent faire, un Bellay, un Jodelle,
> Un Baïf, Pelletier, un Belleau et Tiard,
> Qui des neuf Sœurs en don ont reçu le bel art
> De faire par les vers les grands Seigneurs revivre
> Mieux que leur bastiments, ou leur fontes de cuivre.

These lines were first published in the second half of 1555, and Peletier's admission to the select band was justified by the recent publication not only of his *Art poëtique*, but also of his *L'amour des amours, Vers liriques*. Belleau had not yet published a volume, for his translation of 'Anacreon' did not appear till 1556, but some of his poems were already in print, an ode and a sonnet in Denisot's *Cantiques* (1553), a sonnet in Magny's *Amours* (1553), and his *Papillon* in Ronsard's *Bocage* of 1554. Moreover in 1554 he had begun to translate 'Anacreon' in friendly rivalry with Ronsard.

[1] A Christophle de Choiseul, en la louange de Belleau (VI, 202).
[2] *Œuvres*, V, 64 ff.

To this piece of evidence adduced by M. Laumonier I would add another from Du Bellay's *Regrets*. Sonnet CLII (written after his return to France in the autumn of 1557) is addressed to Ronsard, CLIII to Jodelle, CLIV to Baïf, CLV to Thiard, while in sonnet CLVI mention is made of Belleau, Baïf, Peletier, Ronsard, and Jodelle. Does not this confirm the view that the six poets named in sonnets CLV and CLVI, together with Du Bellay himself, formed the select band to which the term Pléiade was applied?

But the term was not in general use, nor did it originate with Ronsard, at least as a distinctive appellation. This is clear from a passage quoted both by Miss Evers in her edition of Binet's *Life*[1], and by M. Laumonier. To his attack on Ronsard (*Seconde Response*, 1563) Florent Chrestien had prefixed a sonnet in which he speaks of *la Plëiade enyvrée*. Commenting on this in the *Epistre au lecteur* at the head of his *Recueil des Nouvelles Poësies*, published in October, 1563, Ronsard says, 'Il me souvient d'avoir autrefois accomparé sept poëtes de mon temps à la splendeur des sept estoilles de la Pleïade, comme autrefois on avait fait des sept excellens poëtes grecs qui florissoient presque d'un mesme temps,' evidently referring to the passage quoted above from the poem in praise of Belleau[2]. In 1566 and again in 1578 we find another Protestant, Henri Estienne—I am following M. Laumonier—using the word Pléiade as a distinctive and accepted term, and in the same year 1578 a poet named Imbert, who had been a fellow-student with Ronsard and Baïf at the Collège de Coqueret, says in a sonnet addressed to Dorat,

> Car je sçay que ne suis de ta docte brigade,
> Et qu'encor moins je suis de ceux de la Pleïade.

But the term did not become common, for it is not found, points out M. Laumonier, either in any of the funeral orations pronounced in honour of Ronsard, or in Brantome, or in D'Aubigné, or in De Thou, or in Pasquier, or in the first two editions of Binet's *Life* (1586 and 1587). It is only in his third edition (1597) that Binet for the first time says that Ronsard gave the name of the Pléiade to Baïf, Du Bellay, Thiard, Jodelle, Belleau, Dorat and himself. What was Binet's authority for including Dorat in the list? Evidently neither Dorat nor Ronsard. Otherwise, why did he not give the information in the earlier editions of the *Life*? For he was in fairly close relations with Dorat from 1570,

[1] *Critical Edition of the Discours de la vie de Pierre de Ronsard par Claude Binet.* Philadelphia, 1905.

[2] *Œuvres*, VII, 147.

and it was probably in that year that the latter introduced him to Ronsard. M. Laumonier suggests (*Vie*, p. xxxv) that he consulted Florent Chrestien, with whom he was on friendly terms, for the third edition. If this was the case, what is more likely than that he got from him his information about the Pléiade and its members? For, as we have seen, it was Chrestien who used the term in the sonnet prefixed to his *Seconde Response*. It is possible therefore, as M. Laumonier says (p. 224), that Dorat passed among the Huguenots for the seventh star of the Pléiade. But if the Pléiade was never a recognised term with Ronsard and his friends, there is no reason for supposing that the place in the select band of seven which became vacant by the death of Du Bellay was ever filled up. Dorat's place, however, has become established by tradition, and has been consecrated by the inclusion of his poems in Marty-Laveaux's edition of the *Pléiade française*. He was an excellent Greek scholar, and in a sense he inspired the whole movement of the new school, but in his own tongue, at any rate, he was a very poor poet.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

GIBBON AND DANTE.

In my *Dante in English Literature* (Vol. I, pp. 441—2) I was only able to give one reference to Dante by Gibbon. This was from Chapter LXX of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*: 'In the apprehension of modern times, Petrarch is the Italian songster of Laura and love. In the harmony of his Tuscan rhymes, Italy applauds, or rather adores, the father of her lyric poetry; and his verse, or at least his name, is repeated by the enthusiasm, or affectation, of amorous sensibility. Whatever may be the private taste of a stranger, his slight and superficial knowledge should humbly acquiesce in the judgment of a learned nation; yet I may hope or presume, that the Italians do not compare the tedious uniformity of sonnets and elegies, with the sublime compositions of their epic muse, the original wildness of Dante, the regular beauties of Tasso, and the boundless variety of the incomparable Ariosto' (ed. 1855, vol. VII, pp. 391—2).

My attention has been drawn recently by a correspondent (Mr H. M. Beatty) to two other passages in the works of Gibbon in which he makes mention of Dante. The first of these is a mere passing reference

in a note of Gibbon's to his account of John Hawkwood in Chapter LXVI of the *Decline and Fall*:

'After two-and-twenty victories, and one defeat, Hawkwood died, in 1394, general of the Florentines, and was buried with such honours as the republic has not paid to Dante or Petrarch' (ed. cit. vol. VII, pp. 211—12).

The second reference, which occurs in Gibbon's *Antiquities of the House of Brunswick* (1790), is of special interest, as showing that he was acquainted with Dante's *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, a treatise with which Gray was well acquainted, and of which Tyrwhitt, the editor of Chaucer, and Thomas Warton, had some knowledge, but which was otherwise apparently almost unknown in England in the eighteenth century. In the passage in question Gibbon writes:

'The father of the Tuscan muses, the sublime but unequal Dante, had pronounced that Ferrara was never honoured with the name of a poet' (*Miscellaneous Works*, ed. 1796, vol. II, p. 693).

Dante's statement occurs in the first book of the treatise:

'Ferrariensium...nullum invenimus poetasse' (*V. E.*, I. 15, ll. 21—2).

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.

LESSING AND MARMONTEL.

Notwithstanding the careful investigations that have already been made into the sources of Lessing's *Laokoon*, more especially those of H. Blümner in his edition of that work (2nd edition, Berlin, 1880)[1], there is still something to be done in laying bare what might be called the 'literary' sources and antecedents of that work, as opposed to those dealing in the first instance with the theory of painting and sculpture, to which investigators have hitherto chiefly directed their attention. As far as I am aware, no one has yet noticed the remarkable anticipation of Lessing's theories in Marmontel's *Poétique Françoise*, which appeared in two volumes at Paris, in 1763. This book was well-known in Germany; a long review of it with a copious summary of its contents, appeared in the *Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften und der freien Künste*, Vol. XI, i, pp. 13 ff., ii, pp. 289 ff. and Vol. XII, i, pp. 42 ff. (1764–65), and it was translated into German by B. von Schirach,

[1] The English reader will find the matter excellently discussed by Professor W. G. Howard in his recent edition: *Laokoon, Lessing, Herder, Goethe*. Selections edited with an Introduction and a Commentary. New York, 1910.

Bremen, 1765–66. It did not, of course, escape Lessing's notice; he quotes the second volume in Section XVII of the *Laokoon*, and translates a passage from it in the fourteenth number of his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*.

The following passages have, as will be seen, a very immediate bearing on the main problem of the *Laokoon*:

Vol. I, p. 39: Si je dis, comme Simonide, que la Peinture est une Poësie muette, je crois la definir complettement; si je dis que la Poësie est une peinture animée et parlante, *aurium pictura*, je suis encore bien au-dessous de l'idée qu'on en doit avoir.

Pp. 40 f.: La Peinture saisit son objet en action, mais ne le présente jamais qu'en repos. En exprimant ces vers de Virgile:

> Illa vel intactae segetis per summa volaret
> Gramina, nec teneras cursu laesisset aristas,

le Peintre représentera Camille élancée sur la pointe des épis, mais immobile dans cette attitude; au lieu qu'en Poësie l'imitation est progressive et aussi rapide que l'action même. La Poësie n'est donc plus le tableau, mais le miroir de la Nature.

Dans un miroir les objets se succedent et s'effacent l'un l'autre; la Poësie est comme un fleuve qui serpente dans les campagnes, et qui dans son cours répete à la fois tous les objets répandus sur ses bords. Il y a plus: cet espace que parcourt la Poësie est dans l'étendue successive comme dans l'étendue permanente: ainsi le même vers présente à l'esprit deux images incompatibles, les étoiles et l'aurore, le présent et le passé:

> Jamque rubescebat stellis aurora fugatis.

Dans les exemples du tableau du miroir et du fleuve, on ne voit qu'une surface; la Poësie tourne autour de son objet comme la Sculpture, et le présente dans tous les sens.

P. 85: Le tableau superficiel de la Nature est lui seul d'une richesse, d'une variété, d'une étendue à occuper des siècles d'étude. Mais tous les détails n'en sont pas favorables à la Poësie; tous les genres de Poësie ne sont pas susceptibles des mêmes détails. Ainsi le Poëte n'est pas obligé de suivre les pas du Naturaliste.

P. 169: La mort de Laocoon dans l'Énéide est un tableau; l'incendie de Troye est une description; la description differe du tableau, en ce que le tableau n'a qu'un moment et qu'un lieu fixe. La description peut être une suite de tableaux; le tableau peut être un tissu d'images; l'image elle-même peut former un tableau: nous en allons voir des

exemples. Mais l'image, comme je l'ai définie, est le voile matériel d'une idée; au lieu que la description et le tableau ne sont le plus souvent que le miroir de l'objet même.

P. 342: Aussi la Peinture et la Sculpture préferent-elles la Nature en repos à la Nature en mouvement, et cependant elles n'ont jamais qu'un moment à saisir et à rendre; au lieu que la Poësie doit pouvoir suivre la Nature dans ses progrès les plus insensibles, dans ses mouvements les plus rapides, dans ses détours les plus secrets.

Pp. 349 f.: Or les vues dans lesquelles opere la Poësie ne sont pas celles de la Nature: la bonté, la beauté poëtique n'est donc pas la bonté, la beauté naturelle. Ce qui même est beau pour un Art peut ne l'être pas pour les autres: la beauté du Peintre ou du Statuaire, peut être ou n'être pas celle du Poëte, et réciproquement, selon l'effet qu'ils veulent produire. Enfin ce qui fait beauté dans un Poëme, ou dans tel endroit d'un Poëme, devient un défaut, même en Poësie, dès qu'on le déplace et qu'on l'employe mal-à-propos.

These passages are, I think, of sufficient interest to warrant their being reprinted here, more especially as the *Poétique Françoise* is not included, in its original form, in editions of Marmontel's works, and is consequently not easily accessible. It might be rash to claim for the passages the importance of being immediate sources for the *Laokoon*: but a certain suggestive value they undoubtedly had for a mind so keenly receptive towards the ideas of his contemporaries as Lessing's was. Marmontel had probably more understanding than any other of Lessing's predecessors in this field for the peculiar problems which Lessing set himself to solve. Although there is no attempt in the French work to limit the sphere of the poet as regards allegorical and descriptive poetry, such limitation was a reasonable inference from the suggestions thrown out in the two last of the passages quoted.

J. G. Robertson.

London.

DISCUSSIONS.

John Lyly's Relations by Marriage.

My friend Mr J. D. Wilson deserves the gratitude of all students of Lyly for his most interesting note published in the October number of *The Modern Language Review*[1], for he is, I think, quite right in believing that Richard Browne, Lyly's father-in-law, was uncle to Robert Browne the separatist. Not that I am ready to accept his argument as perfectly convincing. The 'allegation' he quotes, if I remember aright, is a rough draught, evidently written from dictation; this being the case, an error in transcribing is out of the question. But this is of little importance, for a better argument can be found in the very document which Mr Wilson has adduced in support of his hypothesis. Reading again a transcript I made several years ago, I find that John Browne is described as 'of Bury' only once, viz. in that part of the document which reproduces the endorsement of the will written in 1605; but in all the rest of the allegation (written in 1611 or 1612) the same John Browne is invariably described as 'of Stamford[2].'

Taking this point as granted, Mr Wilson is right in laying stress upon the importance of Lyly's marriage. If Richard Browne was uncle to Robert Browne the separatist, he was the son of Francis Browne and, therefore, nephew by marriage to Joan Cecil; and Beatrice Browne was distinctly a better match than I have supposed. But I cannot follow Mr Wilson when he imagines that the alliance between Lyly and Beatrice may have 'been arranged by the respective families while the partners were still children,' or when he says: 'If this was the case, the friendly interest that Lord Burghley took in the young Lyly's career is at once explained.' We have not the least tittle of evidence that such an alliance was ever contemplated at so early a date; on the contrary, the late date of the marriage—the bridegroom was thirty years of age—seems to be strongly against the probability of such an arrangement. At any rate, it is safer to reason from indubitable data, and then it seems hardly possible that a marriage concluded in 1583 should have been the cause of an interest which manifested itself in

[1] Vol. v, p. 495.

[2] It is unlikely that there should have been a John Browne known as of Stamford, and another John Browne, alderman of Stamford, both living at the same time. We may say, at least, that the probability is very great that one and the same person is referred to, though of course one should not be too positive in identifying a man whose surname is Brown and whose christian name is John!

1574 and perhaps before. Certainly it would be more rational to reverse the proposition and to say that the interest which Lord Burghley took in Lyly explains the marriage; either by supposing that Queen Elizabeth's Minister brought about the match, or by supposing that Lyly sought an alliance with the Brownes because he saw that he would thus be enabled to claim a sort of relationship to his patron.

There is another point on which I should like to make a few remarks. Mr Wilson declares that the actual disinheriting of Beatrice Lyly by her father 'does not seem to have taken place until after Lyly's death.' Whoever reads the document already referred to will see plainly that the sentence in which Richard Browne said that he disinherited 'his daughter Mrs Stanton' was pronounced by the old man on his death-bed, that is, from internal evidence, in 1611 or 1612; but the will alluded to in that sentence—and from the document it appears indubitably that this was the only testament made by Richard Browne—was sealed and delivered to John Browne in 1605 'on the viijth day of May anno regni Jacobi Anglie &c. tertio et Scotie xxxvij° in anno domini 1605,' that is at a time when Lyly was still alive. This is a fact which cannot be overturned by conjectures, however interesting these may be. Mr Wilson supposes that a son was born to Richard Browne in his old age. But the William Browne who, according to the Mexborough registers, was baptized on the first day of November, 1601, was entered as being the son of 'Richard Browne'; whereas Lyly's father-in-law is always described in the same registers as 'Richard Browne *esquire*.' The most natural inference, therefore, is that the father of the said William was a different man from the influential Mexborough squire. Those who have gone through Paver's Collections and who know what a number of Brownes one meets with in Yorkshire at that period will not be astonished at this statement. I may add that this interpretation seems to be the only possible one, when we remember that, *circa* 1601, Richard Browne's wife must have been, by the most charitable computation, over sixty years of age! Again, Mr Wilson thinks that the disinheriting affair took place because Beatrice 'brought discredit upon the family name by marrying a citizen of London.' No evidence allows us to say that Mr Stanton, the second husband, was 'a citizen' of London, and in the two documents we possess relating to him he is styled esquire. Lastly, Mr Wilson advances as a proof that Richard Browne bore no grudge to the Lylys the fact that Robert-Browne Lyly was later on in prosperous circumstances. One cannot help remarking that the reason Mr Wilson has brought forward to explain why Richard Browne, himself a disinherited grandchild, was in the end a wealthy man, holds good in this case also: to quote Mr Wilson's own words, since Robert-Browne Lyly married into a good family, 'it is probable that his possessions came to him through his wife.'

ALBERT FEUILLERAT.

RENNES.

Suckling and Desportes.

In my review of Mr Tilley's *From Montaigne to Molière*[1] I ventured to assert that 'Suckling a imité et même fréquemment traduit Desportes.' Professor Kastner challenges the accuracy of this statement[2] and takes great pains to explain what he considers an error on my part; I think I shall be able to prove that it was not an error.

Professor Kastner assumes—quite rightly—that my accusation of plagiarism rests chiefly upon the evidence furnished by Suckling's poem *Proffered Love Rejected*, and, as the same piece in a different form figures among the poems of Charles Cotton, under the rubric *Epigramme de Monsieur Desportes*, he seems to have concluded, somewhat hastily, that Cotton was my *only* authority for ascribing the French original to Desportes. Even assuming the existence of a French pattern on which Suckling and Desportes may have worked independently, 'that pattern,' says Professor Kastner, 'was not Desportes. I have searched...the collections of miscellaneous pieces published throughout the seventeenth century but can find no lines of Desportes which could have served as a model for Suckling's or for Cotton's composition.'

If Professor Kastner will refer to *Les Satyres et aultres œuvres folastres du sieur Mathurin Régnier, dernière édition revuë, corrigée, et augmentée de plusieurs pièces de pareille estoffe tant des sieurs de Sigogne, Motin, Torment, Bertelot, qu'aultres des plus beaux esprits de ce temps*, published in Paris in the year 1617—six years only after the last edition of Desportes' works—he will find, under the name of Desportes, the following poem which I quote in extenso:

Il y peut avoir quatre années
Qu'à Philis j'ai voulu conter
Deux mille pièces couronnées,
Et plus haut j'eusse pu monter.

Deux ans après elle me mande
Que pour mille elle condescent.
Je trouvai la somme si grande,
Je n'en voulus donner que cent.

Au bout de six à sept semaines
A cent écus elle revient.
Je dis qu'elle perdait ses peines
Si elle prétendait plus que vingt.

L'autre jour elle fut contente
De venir pour six ducatons.
J'ai trouvé trop haute la vente
Si elle passait quatre testons.

Ce matin elle est arrivée
Gratis voulant s'abandonner,
Où je l'ai plus chère trouvée
Que quand j'en voulus tant donner.

[1] *Mod. Lang. Review*, Vol. v, p. 251.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 497.

For the English versions by Suckling and Cotton I must refer our readers to Carew Hazlitt's edition of Suckling, vol. I, p. 59, and to Chalmers, *English Poets*, vol. VI, p. 722.

A comparison of the English adaptations with the original of Desportes will make the following points clear. (1) The plagiarism is indisputable. (2) Suckling and Cotton must have worked on the same pattern. Cotton's lines keep much closer to the original, and cannot have been derived from Suckling. (3) The 'easy grace,' if easy grace there be, is entirely on the side of Desportes. The only original element contributed by the English imitators is coarseness.

One more point remains to be proved, i.e., that the collection mentioned above (*Les Satyres et aultres œuvres* etc.) must have been the channel through which Suckling became acquainted with Desportes' text. If this can be shown, one is entitled to conclude that, whether the poem is by Desportes or not, Suckling at any rate must have believed that he was imitating Desportes—and that is what really matters.

The 1617 collection contains many pieces by little known French writers, and of these, several were undoubtedly adapted by Suckling. For instance, one of the most characteristic of Suckling's poems—the famous song in *Aglaura*:

> Why so pale and wan, young lover,
> Prithee, why so pale?
> Will, when looking well can't win her,
> Looking ill prevail?
> Prithee, why so pale?

bears a close resemblance to a poem ascribed to Motin, beginning:

> Pourquoi perdez-vous la parole
> Aussitôt que vous rencontrez
> Celle que vous idolâtrez... etc.

Another piece by Suckling:

> 'Tis now, since I sat down before
> That foolish fort, a heart,
> Time strangely spent a year and more,
> And still I did my part, etc.

was obviously inspired by a poem given in our collection:

> Amour, héraut de la beauté
> Qui a ravi ma liberté,
> Sonnant les vertus de ma dame
> De sa trompette à haute voix,
> Est venu sommer plusieurs fois
> La citadelle de mon âme.

Space forbids my quoting more. But if Professor Kastner will refer to the 1617 collection, I think he will agree that Suckling must have known it.

It only remains for me to 'give honour to whom honour is due'; I cannot claim any credit for the above discoveries. My information was derived from the recent researches of M. Georges Bernard, who, a couple of years ago, submitted to the Sorbonne a very interesting thesis on Suckling and his French sources.

H. E. Berthon.

Oxford.

Thanks are due to M. Berthon for pointing out that M. Georges Bernard had identified the original of the poem by Suckling, entitled 'Proffered Love Rejected' (ed. A. Hamilton Thompson[1], p. 55), which poem, by the way, was printed and ascribed to Desportes for the first time, I find, in the second volume of *Le Parnasse des plus excellens poètes de ce temps* (1607), ten years before it appeared in the miscellany quoted by M. Berthon (cf. F. Lachèvre, *Bibliographie des recueils collectifs de poésies publiés de* 1597 *à* 1700, I, p. 163). Even if it be supposed that the poem in question is really by Desportes, one swallow does not make a summer, as the saying goes, and the fact remains that M. Berthon has still to make good his original claim, to which I objected, that 'Suckling a imité et même *fréquemment traduit*[2] Desportes.'

As to the secondary question—whether the poem cited in the above note was really composed by Desportes—I still have grave doubts, since it does not appear to figure in any of the editions of Desportes' works published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or in Michiels' modern edition (1858). M. Berthon attempts to meet this objection by stating that, provided Suckling can be shewn to have become acquainted with the text attributed to Desportes through the medium of the 1617 collection, 'one is entitled to conclude that, whether the poem is by Desportes or not, Suckling at any rate must have believed that he was imitating Desportes—and that is what really matters.' I confess I am unable to understand by what process of reasoning M. Berthon comes to this conclusion. M. Bernard has proved satisfactorily that Suckling knew the miscellany of 1617, but the fact that Suckling adapted a piece there ascribed to Desportes surely does not shew that he did so consciously because it was the work of the once famous Abbé de Thiron. The piece is in no way typical of Desportes' manner. Obviously it was not the supposed author's name, but rather the character of the piece which attracted the Cavalier poet, much of whose verse is notoriously coarse or frankly indecent. For the same reason it found a place in the miscellany of 1617, alongside other typical compositions by such choice spirits as Bertelot, Motin, and the infamous Sigogne.

[1] It is to be regretted that Mr A. Hamilton Thompson, Suckling's latest editor, has not made any mention of the Cavalier poet's foreign sources.

[2] The italics are mine.

On further reflection, I am inclined to think, though I offer this explanation with due reserves, that the poem under discussion is an adaptation and expansion, by one of the 'libertine' poets of the group of Mathurin Régnier, of the following lines of Desportes, which appear under the rubric 'Quelques Epigrammes' in his collected poems (ed. Michiels, p. 443):

> Je voulus baiser ma rebelle,
> Riant, elle m'a refusé;
> Puis soudain, sans penser à elle,
> Toute en pleurs elle m'a baisé:
> De son dueil vint ma jouyssance,
> Son ris me rendit malheureux;
> Voilà que c'est, un amoureux
> A du bien quand moins il y pense.

Leaving aside the unsavoury details, the central idea of the two compositions is very similar; and thus we are probably in presence not of an epigram by Desportes, but of an adaptation by an uncertain hand of one of Desportes' 'épigrammes.'

It remains to be seen whether MM. Vianey and Vaganay will be able further to elucidate this small point in the critical edition of Desportes' works which, I understand, they have in preparation.

L. E. Kastner.

Manchester.

REVIEWS.

Oxford Lectures on Poetry. By A. C. Bradley. London: Macmillan. 1909. 8vo. viii + 395 pp.

Among critics Professor Bradley holds a place by himself. It is not only that he combines two qualities which are seldom found together, a keen and delicate sense of literary beauty, and a trained mastery of philosophical methods and ideas. It is not even, though this is manifestly true, that he possesses each of these in an uncommonly high degree. It is rather that in his mind the two are absolutely blended into one, that the one works instinctively at the bidding of the other, that each is at every point inter-penetrated by the other.

His work therefore differs strangely from that of others who have brought philosophical ideas to bear upon literary criticism. They are apt to be more interested in their philosophy than their literature. They tend to fly off at a tangent, to make their criticism a stepping-stone to a moral or metaphysical discourse. Of this tendency there is no trace in Professor Bradley. He never forgets that criticism is the task he has undertaken, and that, having undertaken it, he cannot fairly leap over the bounds which it manifestly lays down. He has to interpret a given poem; to explain its bearing upon the poet's vision of things as a whole; to explore the poet's spirit, as reflected in the more inspired and therefore the more characteristic portion of his work; to trace his character and his general attitude towards life and all that life offers to him or demands of him; to ask what are the imaginative experiences summed up in certain familiar words—'the sublime' is the instance taken in this volume—or implied in certain forms of imaginative art. This is what he sets himself to do, and not to use the poem, the poet, or the imaginative experience as a mere peg on which to hang an 'Encyclopaedia of the Philosophical Sciences,' or even a 'Critique of Judgment, Practical and Imaginative.' But if Professor Bradley has the courage to shut the door against philosophy as a 'thing in itself,' he makes amends by opening it, and opening it wide, to her as the handmaid of criticism. And it is significant that the subjects which form the bulk of this volume—even the lecture on 'The Letters of Keats' may fairly be included—are such as lend themselves with peculiar readiness to this treatment. Wordsworth, Shelley, the 'Long Poem in the Age of Wordsworth,' were saturated with reflection, with ideas

which lie on the border of philosophy, even when they do not actually cross it. So again are the letters, to say nothing of the poetry, of Keats. And in such subjects as 'Poetry for Poetry's Sake,' or 'The Sublime,' or 'Hegel's Theory of Tragedy,' the connection with philosophy is even closer.

It may be objected that in the latter instances the line which parts criticism from philosophy is actually passed; that the theme here is in truth rather philosophical than literary. This, however, as the theme is handled by Professor Bradley, is not the case. And that is precisely what makes these more abstract lectures so good a test of the soundness of his method. Here, if anywhere, he might be expected to thrust literature into the second place. But this is just what he does not do. And his results are valuable for the very reason that he refuses to do it.

In all three lectures, even in that on 'Hegel's Theory of Tragedy,' he persists in starting from the 'imaginative experience'; and it is by this same experience, perpetually recalled to our memory, that he tests the soundness of the theory at every step of the argument in which it is unfolded. Compare this lecture or that on 'Poetry for Poetry's Sake,' with other works on the same or kindred subjects; and we can hardly fail to be struck with the difference of method. The philosophers—Kant and even Hegel,—the critics—Lessing and even, in his weaker moments, Coleridge—are too apt to bring a theory, ready made and largely coloured by considerations quite other than literary, to the matter, itself avowedly literary, which they have in hand. Lessing for instance, above all things a critic and a very great one, is much more concerned to determine what are 'the rules demanded by the nature of' the Fable in general, than to record what his imagination has experienced in following the movement of any Fable in particular. The tests he applies are purely abstract tests, such as logical coherence and compactness. They are tests that have manifestly more to do with the pure intellect, if such a thing exists, than with the imagination. And the rules obtained in this rough and ready fashion are applied without ceremony to all Fables whatsoever. The result is that the Fables of La Fontaine are ruled out at one stroke; and it is hard to see how that of the Cock and the Fox, as told by Chaucer, can be saved from the same fate.

Of this method Professor Bradley will have nothing. If there is one point on which he is never weary of insisting, one principle which he seldom or never falters in practising, it is that the foundation of all criticism is the 'poetic experience'; that the first function of the critic is to realise, and to realise with all the intensity of which he is capable, the exact and complete effect made upon his imagination by the single poem, or by that which is inspired in the work of the poet, taken as a whole. It is the function not only of the critic, but of every reader worthy of the name. The former may realise more consciously what is precisely the process through which his imagination passes when it is under the spell of the poem; he may be able to analyse

it more fully and more exactly. But, whenever the poem is read aright, the experience is the same in kind; it differs, so far as it does differ, only in degree. To enter, so far as we may enter, into the poet's mind and temper, to feel, so far as without genius it is possible for us to feel, as the poet felt when he saw his vision and, in seeing, made it visible to others, that is the first step both in the more and the less skilled appreciation; that is the raw material with which both critic and ordinary reader have to deal.

Acting on these principles, Professor Bradley finds himself barred out at every turn from those loose generalisations which are the bane of the opposite method. He is forced, as Wordsworth would have said, to 'keep his eye steadily on the object,' to follow every turn and winding of the process which he has set himself to trace. Hence the closeness of his reasoning; and still more, the firmness with which, at each point, it grips the facts that are there to be explained. This is the first, and perhaps the greatest, advantage offered by his method. But there is another which, at any rate as he handles the matter, is drawn in its train. And that is the close understanding which, from the outset, he establishes between the critic and the man who reads or listens solely to enjoy. The one, as has already been said, is bound on exactly the same errand as the other. The only difference is that the former brings, or claims to bring, a wider range, a more disciplined power of observation to the task in question than the latter. He is able, or ought to be able, to interpret the experience of the moment more accurately. And, as this experience is also that of the plain reader, the latter, in following him, is enabled to interpret his own experience more precisely and fully to himself.

As applied to the more general subjects, those treated in the three lectures above mentioned, these methods and principles are fruitful in results. They ensure—at least in the hands of one who follows them out as consistently as Professor Bradley—that all the crucial facts are loyally reckoned with, that the critic shall not do violence to any of them, that he shall not allow one group of considerations to throw all the rest into the shade. Thus, in 'Poetry for Poetry's Sake,' he is as firm against those who reduce all poetry to 'pure form,' as against those who see in it nothing but a given matter taking shape in a certain form, and existing, possibly with no great lessening of its brightness, as a thing separable, in the mind both of poet and reader, from the form in which it is clothed. Each of these explanations is rejected by him on the ground that it is a mere abstraction. They are 'things in the analytic head' of the critic, 'not in the poem.' 'In a poem the true content and the true form neither exist, nor can be imagined, apart.... Its value lies neither in the one nor in the other, nor in any addition of them, but in the poem, where they are not.' (pp. 17, 18.)

In the same way with 'Hegel's Theory of Tragedy.' That theory, according to Professor Bradley—and he had already stated his views by implication in *Shakesperean Tragedy*—is defective because it is

drawn from little more than half the facts. It gives a true and most penetrating account of the poetic experience through which we pass in reading or witnessing the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles. But it hardly even professes to reckon with modern tragedy; nor even with Euripides, who is considered by Hegel, and in many respects with justice, to have deep affinities with the moderns. To Hegel tragedy is a conflict between two of the substantial forces which dominate man's life; each of which in itself is sacred; but each of which in the tragic collision—for instance, that of Antigone and Creon—is pushed to the total exclusion of the other, and therefore becomes a wrong. It is the anguish with which we witness this strife of mighty opposites, each of which we feel to be sacred, that constitutes the tragic sense. No one can say—Hegel himself explicitly denies—that this definition squares with the facts of modern tragedy, with its comparative neglect of 'substantial forces' and the overwhelming stress it lays upon individual personality. And the inevitable inference is that modern tragedy is a declension from the perfect model; that it represents a type which, however high, can never be reckoned with the highest. Against this inference Professor Bradley naturally—and, as most readers will think, justly—rebels. And, while taking Hegel's conception for the basis of his own theory, he proposes to widen it, so as to bring modern tragedy within its scope. Deep as Hegel has gone, can it be said that he has gone deep enough? The essential thing is not that the conflict should be between ethical forces, however 'substantial,' but that it should carry with it waste or destruction of that which is supremely noble, surpassingly heroic. And it is just such a waste of nobility and heroism that makes the core of what is most characteristic in modern tragedy; the essence, for instance, of the tragic experience which comes to us in reading *Othello*, or in watching it acted on the stage. Is it not also, he asks, the essence of Greek tragedy? the inner soul of that conflict between forces, themselves almost external to the tragic figures, which it may readily be admitted is the specific form that the Greek spirit instinctively approved? In Greek, as in modern tragedy we are concerned, at any rate in the first instance, not with abstract forces, but with beings of flesh and blood. In both alike our first thought is for the men and women who have done and suffered before us. It is not for any ethical force, however irresistible; not for any institution, however sacred. It is for Antigone or Orestes. It is for Hamlet, or Lear, or Othello.

It is quite true that, behind these tragic figures, the Greek dramatist makes us feel the presence of powers which, in a certain sense, are more sacred and mightier than they. It is true that modern tragedy, if it does this at all, does it in a very different way. But that proves nothing against the latter. On the contrary, it may prove that modern tragedy, which has disengaged itself from the specific form dear to the Greeks, stands, in its highest examples, for something not less but more 'substantial,' not less but more close to the inner spirit of tragedy than the Greek masterpieces themselves. For the Greek masterpieces

tend to present the tragic issue in a more external, and therefore a more abstract, shape. In modern tragedy, on the contrary, all is inward, concrete, individual.

The explanation thus offered by Professor Bradley has a further advantage. It yields a more adequate account of that sense of reconciliation which, as Hegel insists, is part, and no small part, of our imaginative experience at the close of a Greek tragedy, and which is so perhaps still more manifestly in the case of Shakespeare. If the ultimate theme were really the strife of two forces, both of which (on Hegel's own shewing) are baffled and brought to nought, how could we feel anything but the pity, or even the emptiness, of it all? If, on the other hand, it is the strife of two personalities, the conflict of a heroic figure with another, or with itself, room is left for exultation at the heroism we have witnessed; at the nobility which by the unalterable law of things can never rise to its full height save at the call of consuming passions and at the cost of anguish, devastation and despair. And that, as a matter of experience, is one of the two feelings which struggle for mastery within us, when we are under the spell of a great tragedy. Our heart is torn at the sufferings we have followed step by step. But, when we recall the nobility, the heroic energy, which shines through those sufferings, we are thrilled with what can only be called triumph or exultation. And this is as true of Antigone as of Othello.

So brief an account of a tangled question must necessarily be imperfect. But enough has perhaps been said to shew the skill of Professor Bradley in applying philosophy to criticism; or rather, of setting his critical faculties to work in the light, and by the methods, of philosophy. He does not bring philosophy to criticism from without. On the contrary, he allows the imaginative experience, as illuminated by philosophy, to unfold itself from within. His one quarrel with Hegel is that his theory is too abstract; that it is drawn from too narrow a range of imaginative experience; that he neglects, or puts aside, some of the most crucial facts. His one purpose is to correct the one-sidedness of this theory, to bring into view the facts which it ignores, and then to let the whole mass of experience, thus restored to its integrity, speak once more for itself. 'Patience,' it was once said, 'is the secret of Hegel.' It is also, and in this instance it is still more, the secret of Professor Bradley.

We have lingered so long on our author's treatment of more general subjects that no time is left for considering the application of his method to individual poems, or the works of particular poets. Yet here too, where allowance has been made for the difference of the matter, exactly the same qualities are displayed. There is the same patience, the same persistence in following every winding of the poetic process, the same penetration in fastening upon the crucial points; in a word, the same disciplined instinct—at bottom, it is the philosopher's instinct—for bolting the facts to the bran, and then welding them together again in the strength of the inner principle which his own analysis has laid bare.

After one fashion, this is shewn in the lectures on Wordsworth, on 'The Long Poem in the Age of Wordsworth,' on Shelley's view of Poetry, and on the Letters of Keats. After all that has been said on these subjects, he has found something original to say, and something which the best of those who have previously written upon them will be the readiest to admire. And he has done all this without ever striving to startle or surprise the reader; by his sheer skill in grappling with all the complexities of the matter, and letting the facts—the experience of a keen and clear-sighted imagination—speak for themselves.

After another fashion, it is shewn in the two lectures on 'The Rejection of Falstaff' and on *Antony and Cleopatra*. After yet another, in those on 'Shakespeare the Man,' and 'Shakespeare's Theatre and Audience.' Of all the lectures, that on Falstaff is perhaps the most open to question. It might be argued that here, as in a few passages of his earlier volume, Professor Bradley is too eager to make his favourite author consistent and conscientious, too slow to admit that his creations, with all their vitality, are also figures in a stage-play and, as such, liable to be swept summarily aside at the bidding of theatrical necessity or convenience. Is it not probable, it might be asked, that Shakespeare, finding it necessary to get rid of Falstaff, made up his mind to do so without ceremony and without blushes? that his rejection, so far from serving to shew the seamy side of the King's character, is dictated mainly, if not solely, by theatrical convention? that it is an expedient on a level with the marriage of Isabella and the Duke, so 'scandalously' huddled up—the word is Professor Bradley's own—at the close of *Measure for Measure*?

But, where so much is supremely good, it is ungracious to hint doubts. Indeed, were they much stronger than they are, they would be nothing but small dust upon the balance. And it is only right that this notice should end, as it began, with an unstinted acknowledgement of the author's unique position as a critic, and to add the hope that this volume, which, if not more excellent, is certainly more varied than its forerunner, will be followed by many more. He has won his own results by mother wit and hard thought. It is to be wished that he may long continue to give the benefit of them to others.

C. E. Vaughan.

Leeds.

Essai sur les Principes de la Métrique Anglaise. By Paul Verrier. 3 vols. Paris: H. Welter. 1909–10. 8vo. xi + 354, 232, 344 pp.

According to M. Verrier the raw material of metrics is 'le vers correctement prononcé.' After this, it is surprising to find that the English speakers on whose reading of verse he relies for the bulk of his experiments are, on his own showing, unlikely to pronounce correctly.

'M. La est philologue et s'occupe plus de grammaire que de poésie. M. Le n'est pas grand amateur de vers' (III, p. 214). Verse is an art-form: to rely on the pronunciation of the man in the street, where verse is concerned, is to show incapacity for scientific investigation. Where M. Verrier leaves the perilous guidance of these two incompetents, he falls back on M. Beljame. 'Ma thèse devait être lue par M. Beljame, qui s'intéressait à mon travail, et pour éviter toute discussion oiseuse sur l'accentuation je préférais pouvoir me référer sur ce point aux indications qu'il a données dans son édition de ce poème [Enoch Arden]' (III, p. 271). The 'vers correctement prononcé' turns out to be, then, not the interpretation of an educated and artistically competent Englishman, but the garbling of two Toms or Dicks and the rendering of a distinguished foreigner.

Thus arises the fundamental and hideous error that disfigures M. Verrier's whole work: namely, that all English verse is correctly pronounced when it is pronounced in the style of everyday conversation —as the most pedestrian of prose. M. Verrier will deny that he believes this: but his scansions prove it. This fundamental misconception of verse as an art-form leads M. Verrier into the further confusion of two entirely different kinds of English verse, *alternating* and *non-alternating* (or accentual). No one with the least ear or with the slightest feeling for form in verse could possibly, for a single moment, apply the same principles of scansion to, say (I, p. 190):

> What fields, or waves, or mountains?
> What shape of sky or plain,

and (I, p. 188):

> Suddenly flashed on her a wild desire,

And yet M. Verrier does so. He does not understand that the second example, a heroic verse, is not only, compared to the first, like 'une mélodie savante auprès d'un air populaire,' which is true (III, p. 259), but that, with its greater artistic complexity and sophistication, it belongs to a metrical form totally different and further removed from prose, a form in which the isochronism of prose and of accentual verse is subordinated to the higher artistic principle of alternation.

We need not follow M. Verrier step by step through his phonetic prolegomena. The 'groupe accentuel' constituted by the 'accent grammatical' (I, p. 41) and modified by the 'accent expressif' or by 'une tendance manifeste à l'alternance' (p. 53) is a familiar conception. Professor Lewis, in his remarkable *Principles of English Verse* (1906), has accustomed us to the idea that prose falls into isochronous segments and that this isochronism is increased in oratorical and poetic diction. M. Verrier holds also, like Prof. Lewis, that the difference between verse and prose 'consiste essentiellement dans la forme des segments' (p. 70) and in their combinations (p. 86). But throughout his book, M. Verrier lays stress, not so much on these characteristic differences of verse and prose but, illogically, on the very isochronism which is, in his opinion,

common to both and cannot therefore differentiate them. He would have spent his space more profitably in clarifying the expression of his own ideas than in abusing his predecessors in metric research[1].

We now reach M. Verrier's specific treatment of verse as verse. His insistence (p. 148) on stress as the sole exteriorisation of ictus, and his assertion that 'on ne doit pas employer comme forte une syllabe moins accentuée que les syllabes voisines, en tout cas que *la suivante*' seem to me to be particularly dark spots in a tissue of errors.

M. Verrier does not distinguish verse that is alternating from verse that is not. And, consequently, since the distinction of *rising* and *falling* exists only in alternating verse, he insists on confusing these two species of rhythm[2]. Of falling rhythm, his dictum as to the relation of 'forte' and succeeding syllable is no doubt true. In rising rhythm the reverse is certainly the case, as e.g. in the line,

Was master: then would Philip, his blue eyes...

the word 'his' is certainly more accented than the second syllable of 'Philip,' but it is *less* accented than the succeeding syllable 'blue.' Of course M. Verrier, who does not consider the heroic verse strictly alternating, scans this line

Was máster: thén would Phílip, his blúe éyes,

—a scansion to me absolutely absurd[3].

In non-alternating verse, it is no doubt true that the 'temps marqué' always corresponds to an increase of intensity. In alternating verse, it is as certainly false. The 'temps marqué' is frequently (in

[1] E.g. A long list of metrists including Mr Omond, Mr Thomson and Prof. Lewis are (p. 145 note) deficient in 'une connaissance suffisante du rythme en général, de la phonétique, de la physiopsychologie et de l'histoire de la versification anglaise,' and (on p. 200 note) the present reviewer is misrepresented as finding Shelley 'peu harmonieux' in certain verses of *Epipsychidion* and considering that he has 'mal rythmé ses vers.' What he *did* say: 'Shelley ne soigne pas trop sa versification, qui échappe à toutes les règles,' M. Verrier repeats himself in other words and more fully (pp. 206, 300).

[2] Of course on pp. 153 sqq. he speaks of 'La marche du rythme' as being 'croissant,' 'décroissant,' 'croissant-décroissant,' 'décroissant-croissant,' and gives several marvellous examples, telling us, for example, that the line: 'And the sheen of their spears was like stars on the sea' is 'croissant,' but the line: 'And his cohorts were gleaming in purple and gold' is 'croissant-décroissant.' But all that is apparently in the air, for, when he comes to scansion, he rejects (pp. 196 sqq.) any except the 'décroissant' as being useless and inexact.

[3] M. Verrier is not even consistent. In Vol. II, p. 315, *à propos* of the line,

But néver mérrily beat Ánnie's heárt

(which he prefers to scan as shown—for once happily and convincingly) he declares that '*beat* est moins accentué que la forte suivante' and seems to urge this undoubted fact as a proof of his scansion. This is inconsistent. Since the scansion is (to him) falling, the relation of 'beat' to the following syllable should be (to him) of little or no consequence. He should have asked, on his own theory, whether 'beat' was more or less accented than the last syllable of 'merrily.' To justify his scansion, 'beat' would have to be *less* accented than the last syllable of 'merrily.' It obviously is *not* so. Either M. Verrier's theory or his scansion is wrong. And the scansion is certainly right.

the case of so-called inversions) marked by an increase of what M. Verrier calls 'acuité,' i.e. pitch, e.g. in the lines,

> Suddenly flash'd on her a wild desire,
> Take your own time, Annie, take your own time,
> From the dread sweep of the down-streaming seas.

Examples abound. All these lines are strictly alternating, but the prose-stress does not in all cases correspond with the verse ictus, which is, once in the first line, three times in the second, and twice in the third, marked by a rise of pitch. This pitch accent exists potentially and is used occasionally in prose to bring out some particular ethos, but is much more frequently met with in verse, especially in alternating verse, a very high art-form, in which very delicate shades of emotion are brought out (cf. Saran, *Deutsche Verslehre, passim*). Read such verses as unemotional prose and their full meaning disappears. Read them as strictly alternating verse, with the proper pitch accents, and the emotional values are at once brought out.

The facts seem to be these: (1) Under certain circumstances of emotion, dissyllables normally accented on the first syllable, with a short second syllable which is capable of lengthening, tend to an equalisation of length, and possibly of stress also, over both syllables, with a rise of pitch on the second syllable; (2) proparoxytonic trisyllables behave in similar circumstances in the same way, so far as the first two syllables are concerned; (3) groups of two closely related monosyllables[1] fulfilling the same conditions behave similarly. This rise of pitch, or pitch-accent, may then serve, instead of the normal stress-accent, to mark the verse ictus. Indeed, when such a pitch-accent arises in this way, in English alternating verse, it is usually preferred as ictus-marker to the stress-accent immediately preceding it[2]. (4) In lines like

> Felt the light of her eyes into his life

or

> This precious stone set in the silver sea,

I have no doubt that a somewhat similar process affects the groups 'felt the,' 'light of,' 'set in,' although these are not dissyllables of the kind mentioned or closely related monosyllables. It is less easy to dogmatize here, but I think that here also there is an equalisation of length as between the two syllables, possibly of stress also, with a rise of pitch on the second, and that this rise of pitch is used by the poet to mark the verse-ictus. All difficulty of nomenclature might be very easily avoided by adopting Saran's term 'weight' for the quality in a syllable (whatever its cause) that makes it capable of marking the verse-ictus. We may ask also, indeed, whether the isochronism of prose and of non-alternating verse, far from being the basis of alternating verse, does not even, to some extent, disappear in such lines as

[1] E.g. the first two words of the line, 'Show me the fair would scorn to spy.'
[2] Cf. Draat, *Rhythm in English Prose*, 1910, pp. 11—12.

these, whether indeed, this non-isochronism of the 'temps marqués' is not a feature of the supreme verse-form—the alternating? It seems probable that the prose isochronism persists more or less as between stress and stress, but not as between ictus and ictus, in so far as any ictus is marked not by prose stress but by pitch. Isochronism is obviously less necessary in strictly alternating verse than in non-alternating (or *mixed*) verse.

Most, if not all, of M. Verrier's mistakes arise from these fundamental confusions. Nearly all his scansions are vitiated thereby. His whole treatment of 'anacruse' becomes the merest and most pernicious nonsense, if we do not accept his non-differentiation of rising and falling rhythm and his denial (for it amounts to that) of alternating verse in English. In so far as English verse is 'mixed' or non-alternating, i.e. in lyric measures at least, he is, on the whole, correct and illuminating. Here it can with justice be contended that rising and falling rhythms are more or less undifferentiated, and that isochronism is more or less stringently carried through, the 'temps marqués' being accompanied by prose stresses: for, paradoxical as it may seem, lyric measures are much nearer prose than the heroic verse and other alternating forms. Popular verse is never alternating.

In verse M. Verrier calls the 'segments rythmiques' by the name of 'pieds' or feet, which he defines (p. 158) as 'la durée comprise entre deux temps marqués successifs.' He adds: 'En tout cas, c'est seulement la division du vers en intervalles compris entre deux temps marqués qui fournit une scansion rationelle, une *scansion normale*.' And so we are landed in a wilderness of anacrusis and of feet overlapping lines.

M. Verrier's distinction between dissyllabic, trisyllabic and mixed rhythms involves him (I, pp. 314, 318) in the implication that lines like:

> There is a path on the sea's azure floor,

or

> When night makes a weird sound of its own stillness,

are instances of mixed rhythm. It may be asserted that heroic verse is at all times dissyllabic, never mixed in any way at all, save in certain modern imitators of their own false reading of older poets, e.g. of Milton, who wrote no trisyllabic feet in *Paradise Lost*, though he has been credited with many. A few stray trisyllabic feet in some otherwise irreproachable writers may also be due to a lingering taint of Old English accentual versification totally out of place in alternating verse, however suitable to non-alternating measures.

M. Verrier's answer to the question: Qu'est-ce qu'un vers? is not quite satisfactory, the more so as it leads him to malign the verses:

> Had I been any god of power, I would
> Have sunk the sea within the earth or ere
> It should the good ship so have swallowed and
> The fraughting souls within her.—Be collected.

'C'est là tout simplement une prose rythmée, qu'on persiste à diviser machinalement en groupes plus ou moins égaux de pieds ou de syllabes.' Why this unfortunate passage should be declared devoid even of final melodic cadence (one of his verse-end criteria), and why it should therefore become mere prose, and be hanged forthwith, is very difficult to understand. If it is verse and if its author meant it as verse, as I suppose, it can be read as verse, and this reading will bring out its full ethos and will show the final melodic cadence, and also, if I am not mistaken, a tolerably strong accent on the final syllables.

The whole chapter is not particularly convincing, but its concluding words are the least convincing of all:

> Dans les vers libres de Southey, de Coleridge, de Shelley, de Tennyson, et surtout de Walt Whitman, la division en vers se confond presque toujours avec la division logique et phonétique en phrases, membres de phrases, etc. En pareil cas, les vers se distinguent bien les uns des autres. J'ai fait remarquer qu'en divisant d'après le sens et les silences bien des passages du *Paradise Lost* on obtient des vers analogues à ceux de Whitman.

But surely such lines are *not* verses. A verse is more than this and especially it is not this. A verse is in the first place a *metrical* entity. It may or may not be also a logical or phonetic entity. But the one thing is not necessarily the same as either of the other two. Moreover the rearranged lines from Milton (p. 182) *are* mere rhythmic prose, for the line cadence or whatever it is that constitutes the line, carefully fitted by the poet to the sense, falls in the rearrangement in the wrong place, confusing the whole ethos of the passage.

We come now to the application of the theory to the scansion of actual verses. Here the fundamental errors of M. Verrier work havoc with all sanity. We find a passage from Tennyson's *Vision of Sin* (evidently trochaic) classed with a number of heroic lines (as evidently iambic) as 'Vers commençant par une forte.' 'Les vers de ces deux séries commencent exactement de la même manière et présentent exactement les mêmes formes rythmiques' (p. 187). If M. Verrier's ear cannot distinguish

> Gathering up from all the lower ground,

or

> Woven in circles: they that heard it sighed,

from

> Knowledge enormous makes a God of me,

or

> Suddenly flash'd on her a wild desire,

he must be proclaimed incompetent to judge of English verse, with or without the aid of M. Beljame. The first two verses are alternate-falling while the last two are alternate-rising: there is no getting away from that.

M. Verrier's reasons (I, p. 198) for rejecting rising scansion are no better than his theory. 'Elle creé une distinction inutile et inexacte.... L'anacruse est presque toujours plus ou moins facultative.' The latter

is particularly false. Alternating trochaics never (or almost never) begin with what he calls an anacrusis: alternating iambics always (or almost always) do. Why, on M. Verrier's theory, is a nine-syllable blank without this supposed anacrusis so very rare as to be, in modern verse, almost an impossibility, while a ten-syllable blank is good and usual whether beginning with an unaccented syllable or with an apparent inversion? Why is the line:

Down in the blue-bells, or a wren light rustling,

a good blank verse, but the same line shorn of its first syllable a very bad one? If the anacrusis is a matter of moonshine, one should be as good as the other.

Moreover I cannot admit, as M. Verrier seems to wish (I, p. 200), that the falling nature of English accentuation is a reason for adopting falling scansion. There is no obvious connection between the two. Metrics and phonetics do not necessarily divide speech into the same groups or in the same way. The derivation of English alternating iambic verse from French, and through French from a certainly rising Latin verse, makes for the rising scansion of iambic alternating verse[1]. But a believer in alternating verse cannot argue convincingly with a non-believer. I fear M. Verrier will only shrug his shoulders at my criticisms and repeat that I am deficient in knowledge of rhythm in general, phonetics, physiopsychology and the history of English versification. So be it: I shall not follow M. Verrier through his forest of false scansions[2]. Suffice it to say that all he has to say about 'coupes' and internal anacrusis is really beside the point. The 'coupes' are in no wise really metrical. They may on his own showing

[1] On p. 201 M. Verrier shows how rising scansion disfigures certain trochaic and dactylic verses. Of course it does. Nothing is proved. No one wants to scan trochaic verse with rising scansion. I do not think his argument (pp. 202—3) from the lines,

So these were wed, and merrily rang the bells,
Merrily rang the bells and they were wed,

is in any way conclusive. The word 'merrily' in the first line is intended to be read as a dissyllable. In the second line the alternation demands just that higher pitch on the second syllable of 'merrily' which a proper reading of the line with due regard for its ethos secures. To scan the two 'merrily's' in the same way as 'mérrily' would make of Tennyson's repetition a mere repetition and nothing more. The case becomes even stronger if the next line is included:

But never merrily beat Annie's heart.

Here 'merrily' has its normal accentuation. Anyone who cannot hear that these three 'merrily's' are *not* mere repetition but have three separate emotional values corresponding to three different accentuations, is devoid of the necessary equipment for writing on English verse.

[2] One further example will suffice: M. Verrier, on p. 218, scans Shelley's line,

Rugged and dark, winding among the springs

as part of a greater asclepiad, because *read as prose*, it matches part of Swinburne's real greater asclepiad,

Áh! thy lúminous éyes! Ónce was their líght féd with the fíre of dáy.

But the ethos of Swinburne's line, because he was a competent if not a great poet, demands just this accentuation and scansion. The line was written as a greater asclepiad. Shelley's line was written as a heroic, and was intended to be read with alternating rhythm. The rhythm of the two verses is very far from being 'identique.'

occur anywhere in the verse. Of course the silences at the 'coupes' count in the isochronous intervals (if these exist) but the 'coupes' are not, in general, real cæsuras and are not analogous to real cæsuras.

The second volume is, in the main, devoted to a discussion of the nature of rhythm. Much is irrelevant. The most interesting chapter of the relevant part deals with 'l'origine et évolution des mètres poétiques.' Passing over such interesting topics as Persian and Chinese versification, we reach M. Verrier's discussion of French verse, a most important preliminary to any consideration of the origin of English alternating verse.

Old French verse was, he declares, 'incomplètement accentuel... L'accent et le temps marqué ne coïncident forcément qu'à la fin du vers et, dans certains mètres, à un autre endroit' (II, p. 135). And he scans

Gránz fu li dóls fórt marriménz,

the accents 'granz' and 'fort' not corresponding to the 'temps marqués' which fall on 'fu' and the first syllable of 'marrimenz.'

All this is very doubtful. But when (p. 142) M. Verrier asserts that Modern French versification takes no account of the 'temps marqué' except at the end of the line (and in certain verse forms at the cæsura)—there can be no doubt that, in spite of his contemptuous dismissal (p. 142, note 3), Tobler and Professors Wulff, Stengel and Saran are right and M. Verrier (following Becq de Fouquières, Prof. Grammont and most French metrists) is wrong. 'Dans une versification incomplètement accentuelle, comme l'était à l'origine celle du français, il y a souvent conflit entre le temps marqué et l'accentuation ordinaire. C'est celle-ci qui a fini par l'emporter chez nous, malgré sa faiblesse relative, probablement au XVII[e] siècle. Il en résulte qu'aujourd'hui le rythme de nos vers repose sur l'accentuation; il n'a plus rien à voir avec le rythme primitif.' In other words the alexandrine has to-day the metre (more or less) of

The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold

mingled (to taste) with that of:

Thus, rolling in her burning breast, she strait to Acolia hied,

in other words, is a hash of irreconcilable fragments.

M. Verrier declares that 'M. Saran a tort de tenir compte des accents secondaires, qui s'effacent pour notre oreille; il faut scander,

Je viéns selon l'uságe...
...à péine un petit nómbre.'

Whatever M. Verrier says, these hemistichs *cannot*, even as everyday prose, be pronounced without a slight stress (the least will be sufficient) on one or other of the unstressed syllables between the stresses marked. Rhythmical considerations would suggest the second of the three unstressed syllables as the one to be slightly stressed. It is true that in an everyday prose reading this stress will be very slight indeed.

But in an emotional reading, a reading calculated to bring out the full ethos of the line, it will be far from negligible. No one will assert that it is as great as that of the syllables which M. Verrier has stressed: but it exists. The word 'petit,' for example, must, to make sense, to bring out the emotional value of the word, be read with the first syllable stressed (I have Rousselot and Passy with me). The 'temps marqué' corresponds in French, as in English verse, frequently to a quite small increase of intensity.

All that Molière did, if, as M. Verrier says, he substituted 'une diction naturelle à la déclamation de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne,' was to introduce into the theatre an unrhythmical and inartistic prose reading of verse—in other words to speak verse as if it were prose, a taint which the French stage has unfortunately preserved not only in light comedy, where it may be in its place, but in the highest forms of tragedy, to such an extent that many (if not most) Frenchmen imagine this merely bad prose to be verse, and are deaf to the finer harmony of the real alexandrine. Many poets have even been led astray into writing alexandrines (so-called) on this basis. All that M. Verrier's attack on Professor Saran and his attempted justification of it prove is that M. Verrier too is tainted with this abomination of desolation that scans

Le soléil le revêt d'éclatántes couléurs.

The third volume is a record of experimental work, devoted to an attempted proof of isochronism in verse. Its value, even granting freedom from error, is doubtful. When M. Verrier has proved, if he does prove, that stresses in verse are separated by equal intervals or approximately equal intervals of time, or has shown how, when this is not the case, various influences militate against the expected and normal isochronism—and M. Verrier is a little too clever at that—nothing is really proved at all with regard to the metre of verse that does not depend entirely on stress. M. Verrier ignores, as in the first two volumes, the possibility of alternation as a principle of verse. His experiments on alternating verse are therefore valueless. Before they can offer any interest, he must prove that the principle of this verse is not alternating but accentual. This he has not tried to do: he has assumed it: for the *petitio principii* of showing that the intervals between the stresses are isochronous and deducing the accentual nature of the verse from that is, of course, no proof. He reads the verses as prose: they will naturally show the isochronism of prose. Even if, read as verse, they were still isochronous, this would be no proof that their metre depends on isochronism.

The experiments on admittedly accentual verse are of considerable value—but even here M. Verrier has done little more than to show that the isochronism of prose persists in them, possibly somewhat strengthened and regularized; and even here, of course, Messrs La and Le's unemotional and incompetent reading of verse must be reckoned with, but the source of error is not so great as in the case of alternating verse.

When we at last, after many preliminaries, reach the experiments on verse proper, we are brought up (p. 189) by the assertion, in reference to heroic verse: '*Puisque le rythme du vers est accentuel*' (the italics are mine), 'le temps marqué ne saurait correspondre à un phénomène quelconque, mais seulement à un phénomène accentuel, tel que le maximum ou l'accroissement maximum de l'intensité, qui se trouvent toutes deux dans la voyelle'—as fine an example of *petitio principii* as one could meet with.

The line analysed is a perversion of Tennyson:

He pássed his dáys in péace amóng his péople.

M. Verrier gets for this line feet respectively of 61, 54, 56 and 52 cs. 'Il y a une accélération continue. Par suite de cette accélération et du renforcement métrique initial...le premier pied est de beaucoup le plus long.' Dividing by ten M. Verrier gets 6, 5, 6, 5 or by dipodies 11, 11. I must protest against M. Verrier's arithmetic. The dipodies actually give 115, 108, or 11·5, 10·8, which are not correctly represented by 11, 11[1].

An interesting series is that analysed on pp. 231 sqq.:

Show me the fair would scorn to spy,
Close on the hounds the hunter came,
Mountain and meadow, moss and moor,
Pennons and flags defaced and stained.

These all show 'initial inversion,' are alternating, and are completely spoiled by accentual reading. The results for the four lines, calculating from accent to accent, are, respectively,

57·4	62·5	61	cs.
50·4	49·5	45·6	cs.
59·4	49·1	46	cs.
68·1	53·1	64·4	cs.

a series which M. Verrier (p. 241) finds 'tout aussi près de l'isochronisme que les plus réguliers de mes chansons.' Possibly. But the isochronism is not obvious to my prejudiced mind.

Did Mr La (the grammarian) read these verses accentually or alternatingly? He probably read them badly in any case. M. Verrier, to whom alternation is an impossibility, supposes them to have been read accentually. I doubt it. In the line,

Show me the fair would scorn to spy,

the second syllable 'me' shows a higher pitch than the first or third (III, pp. 235, 255). It is a pity M. Verrier does not give the pitch analysis for the other lines. It might help to suggest that Mr La

[1] M. Verrier's experiments bear (consistently with his theory) on *intervals* from accent to accent. A five-beat line has only 4 complete intervals, a four-beat line only 3. He measures in millimetres, which he converts, in accordance with his scale, to hundredths of a second.

read these lines alternatingly. It would not then be very surprising that isochronism is not marked in them.

The next verse analysed is:

A wét sheét and a flówing séa.

With the accentuation indicated the results were (III, p. 244) 42, 58, 54. Then M. Verrier (p. 245) uses the *same reading and the same record* to show that the scansion,

A wét sheet ánd a flówing séa,

gives 40, 50, 40, and is therefore less isochronous! The same record! Surely Mr La read either one way or the other! A fresh reading and fresh record were surely necessary. Nothing whatever is proved except M. Verrier's want of scientific method and common-sense.

I must protest that the series 59, 58, 43, 45 cs., as obtained for a parody of a line of Tennyson's read by Mr La,

He passed his days in peace among his sheep,

cannot, by any conceivable process consistent with scientific accuracy be reduced (p. 260) to 1, 1, 1, 1. The same applies to the line,

He sent abroad a shrill and terrible cry,

which, read by Mr La, gave 53, 60, 51, 59 cs., reduced unblushingly by M. Verrier to 1, 1, 1, 1. The line,

Dárk as a fúneral scárf from stém to stérn,

read thus accentually by Mr La, gave (p. 262) the series 67, 65, 74, 64. Mr Le's reading (he is the man who does not care for verse) gave 80, 77, 77, 70. I fail to see how isochronism can be inferred.

Mr Le's reading of

Énoch was hóst one dáy, Phílip the néxt,

with the accentuation noted, gave 85, 85, 60, 67. M. Verrier has not the courage to reduce this to equality. But he does his best by suggesting (p. 266) that 'le temps change brusquement à la césure.'

All M. Verrier's experiments suggest the observation that, since he has analysed his records as if the lines recorded had been read with Prof. Beljame's accentuation (III, p. 271) and since there is absolutely no certainty that Messrs La and Le read them with that accentuation, the whole series of experiments is entirely devoid of value. 'Il n'y aura de définitive qu'une métrique expérimentale' (III, p. 184). Possibly. But the experimenter must rid his mind of prepossessions, must have his verses read by competent readers, and must analyse his records without reference to the pronunciation prescribed by any one at all.

THOMAS B. RUDMOSE-BROWN.

DUBLIN.

The Works of Thomas Nashe. Edited by RONALD B. MCKERROW. 5 vols. London: Sidgwick and Jackson. 1904—10. 8vo. xvi + 386, 397, 416, 484, xii + 382 pp.

It is the tendency of contemporary scholarship to leave no figure unframed in the labyrinthine gallery of literary portraits, and, in the fulness of time, we now find Thomas Nashe mounted, encased and hung in a style not likely to be changed for many generations. And yet, after reading carefully through these five volumes, one ends by doubting whether Nashe in any setting can ever occupy more than a most subordinate position in the history of literature. He came to his age with an amazingly versatile brain, a keen interest in human nature, a marked gift for satire and—an author's most precious possession—a knack of infusing his own personality into everything he wrote. But he came, unhappily, just before the literary art was sufficiently developed to give scope to his peculiar talents. The literature of the people—jest-books, ballads, complaints, visions, mock testaments, dialogues, parodies and 'group'-satires—had at last come into contact with academic learning. On the one hand laymen had now both the inclination and the opportunity to penetrate the realm of classical and scholastic literature, and on the other hand those who had caught the enthusiasm for the new learning found that they no longer needed to remain in academic servitude, that a reading public existed to which they could appeal on their own merits, in fact, that they could make a living by their pens. The one problem was to discover what Londoners wanted to read. At first sight the prospect must have seemed pleasing enough to the intellectually emancipated of the new era, especially to a writer like Nashe, who shared the thoughts of the average man, but invented original ways of expressing them. Consequently there sprang up a generation of clever and eccentric youths, not unlike the French romantic school in character, who had escaped from their own class and had entered, without due preparation, into the dangerous possession of knowledge. Hence they became intensely individualistic, in comparison with the average burgher, over-confident in their right to live and think according to the ideals of the past, and mutineers against social and intellectual conventionality. These young men, with more brains than experience, must, however, soon have realised that insurmountable obstacles still stood between them and success. To begin with, the prejudice still existed against men without a recognised status. There was a feeling that each member of society should keep his proper place in his own class, and Robert Crowley, forty years earlier, had stigmatised deviations from this established order as sin against God. Thus, though public opinion had broadened since Tudor times, the professional pamphleteer, who merely wrote to amuse, was still viewed with distrust, and it needed a genius to win the way to the hearts of the people and gain their respect as well as their patronage. Even Robert Greene, for all his idealism and poetry, had remained nothing but an inspired

Bohemian, relegated to the society of the underworld, till his obscure existence was cut short by a pauper's death.

The popular *littérateur*, besides contending against the curse of the Midianites, had another labour to accomplish. He had to create his profession. Elizabethan culture had no grooves ready made along which popular ideas could spread. The reading public had not yet been educated to expect certain things. Neither the theatres, the Court nor the universities had supplied recognised standards of taste for the middle class. The book-trade was in a state of anarchy; the censorship was arbitrary and tyrannical; plagiarism was unchecked. A code of literary manners had not yet been evolved. Free-lances had no special forms of procedure, ways of thinking and expressing themselves. They had no professional etiquette, none of the characteristics of a class. Each man had to feel his own way, and much of the extravagance, obloquy, wantonness and buffoonery of the tract literature is due to this lack of organisation.

To this struggle for life Nashe brought his peculiar gifts and his peculiar failings. With his power of invective and a tolerable facility in versifying, he might have made his mark as a satirist or epigrammatist, but formal satire was as yet hardly introduced, and was certainly not a sufficiently 'marketable' product for a bread-winner. With his wide reading, his power of applying classical lore to the subject under discussion, his vivacity, his gift of seeing a familiar object in a new light, Nashe might, some thirty years later, have become a unique essayist or character-writer. But even if the literary coteries afterwards made famous by the names of Bacon or Overbury had begun to circulate their effusions in manuscript, no essay or character-sketch had yet reached the larger public. Had Nashe been an original thinker or an earnest moralist, he might have overcome all these obstacles, in a society hopelessly perplexed by its own rapid growth and eager for enlightenment. But he was at best a prophet without a message, and hence he remained an ephemeral pamphleteer. In his efforts to catch the public ear he poured new wine into old bottles. His compositions have generally the form and framework of some old-fashioned type of literature which he attempted to enliven, and frequently overburdened, with anecdotes, invective and comment on his own times. Thus *The Anatomie of Absurditie* begins with a treatise against women quite in the spirit of medieval compositions. *Pierce Penilesse* is cast into the form of a 'complaint' and plays on the pre-reformation theme of the seven deadly sins. *Lenten Stuffe* is a burlesque encomium. *The Unfortunate Traveller* contains the usual escapades and roguery of the jest-books, and the two descriptions of public executions—quite unnecessarily introduced—read like the 'horrible details' of the broadsides. In so turbulent and contentious an age it was not to be expected that literary men would be less quarrelsome than their betters, and Nashe, the writer without a theme, was only too ready to employ his satirical gift in any controversy which came in his way. In one passage of *Pierce Penilesse*, very similar to

Horace's manifesto in the first essay of the second book of *Satires* (ll. 45 ff.), he deliberately took up the pose of a controversialist, who makes a business of lampooning any adverse critic. Instead of appearing as a reformer, he only became a storm centre. He figured in the Marprelate controversy, he inveighed against the vices of foreigners, he exposed the abominations of the London stews. Two of his most striking productions are purely personal attacks on the Harveys, in which all his wit and learning (after the manner of Renascence scholars) are devoted to sheer vituperation.

Thus with the exception of *The Unfortunate Traveller*, a realistic novel born out of due season, the works of Nashe are little else than literary curiosities, that is to say, compositions in which the author's gifts have found a now obsolete form of expression. As such, he can be of only minor interest to the student of the history of literature. Most of his work bears every trace of hurry; whole pages often seem written merely to fill up space; he deals at length with the most trivial topics, and appears to make a point of startling his readers with colloquialisms and *argot*. All these characteristics render him so much the more valuable to the student of manners and language, and it is from this point of view that Mr McKerrow has written his elaborate commentary. The extant texts have been carefully collated; the bibliographical introductions are models of method, and the notes are admirably concise. Practically every quotation is traced to its source and quoted with its context, and, as has already been shown of Jonson's *Discoveries* and will probably be one day shown with Bacon's *Essays*, many of Nashe's most striking passages are proved to be unacknowledged plagiarisms. But this edition is much more than an explanation and appreciation of Nashe. It is a collection of research notes on the archaisms and antiquities to be found in Nashe's writings. In many cases the editor not only supplies but surpasses our needs for elucidation of obscure passages, as in his notes on 'filthy Thames water' (I, 174), Mother Bunch (I, 174), 'you liue (like sumners) upon the sinnes of the people' (I, 216), 'he will look your head' (I, 242), 'Tittle est amen' (I, 366), Ovid's quotation in I, 375, Mumpsimus (II, 93), Aristotle drowning himself in the Nile (II, 119), 'a sloth of souldioury' (II, 155), 'cryde creake' (II, 34), H. S. (III, 147), Mother Mampudding (III, 200), Orion's discourse on dogs (III, 254), 'the Kid in Aesop' (III, 316). These, and innumerable other pieces of information, are made doubly valuable to the Elizabethan student by a very complete index.

And yet the reader cannot help regretting that so erudite and painstaking a commentator has chiefly confined his attention to philological and bibliographical difficulties. These, the more solid if less showy duties of editorship, should certainly claim his first consideration. But in reading so prolix and vivacious an author as Nashe, we meet with many topics and questions which make up the essence of Elizabethan and Jacobean life, and which are not adequately treated of elsewhere. Why have we no illuminating note on the demonology of *The Terrors of the Night*? Mr McKerrow suspects that the tract is

largely indebted to some source which he cannot trace. Such is certainly the case, for the whole controversy was based upon authority, and from Sprenger to John Webster there is hardly an argument advanced which was not derived from patristic theologians or scholastic dogmatists. And yet no controversy is more characteristic of the age or more worthy of comment. Why have we no note on literary caricature, which in the satirical description of Gabriel Harvey (III, 93) reaches a point beyond the attempts of previous lampoonists, and rises into the class of the Jacobean pseudo-Theophrastians? Again, why have we no note on Golias (III, 85), on the account of quack doctors (I, 363—6), who were the theme of so many diatribes and exposures in this age, on 'the diuell of late is growen a puritane' (I, 367), on the seven liberal sciences (III, 151), on the 'millers thombe' (III, 153), on Hermes Trismegistus (III, 273)? The vext question of foreign travel (II, 297), which was already dividing moralists into two camps, is not annotated, except for an incomplete summary *à propos* of 'Italinated' (I, 10). The note is insufficient on the fall of Antwerp and its influence on English sentiment (II, 81), and so are the notes on the 'Ship of Fooles' (I, 175), on burlesque encomia (III, 176), on 'Gyllian of Braynfords Will,' and on mock testaments in general (III, 235).

Here and there a few suggestions and corrections present themselves. In I, 256 'sampsound' is probably a reference to Chaucer (*Pardoner's Prol.*, 553 f.). In II, 4 the date should be 16 Sept. 1593. In III, 161 'bruite' is probably used in the same sense as in the phrase 'like bruite beasts' (III, 215): it must be remembered that the Britons and not the Saxons were supposed to be descendants of Brute. In III, 176 Nashe has misunderstood Chaucer's line, in which 'tart' is an adjective. In III, 226 'Meonian' presumably means Homeric, that is, a worthy theme for epic poetry.

As regards the date of *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, the editor takes one set of allusions (e.g. ll. 130 and 1847) to indicate some period previous to 6th Sept., and another set to refer to some later date, say October, 1592, when the Queen had finished her progress in the Midland Counties and was present at the performance. But ll. 130 ff. may well mean that summer ought to have died a month ago but has been kept alive on a sick bed till the Queen's progress should be over, and ll. 1845—9 need not imply that autumn has not begun, but merely that he is to reserve his 'goodliest ripened fruites' for the Queen, and stay his ravages along her route. It seems extremely unlikely that the Queen was among the audience when this piece was acted. No passage implies her presence, and some lines (e.g. 388—403) would hardly have been tolerated by the imperious dame.

The introduction, from start to finish, is scholarly and excellent, so far as it goes. But in avoiding the cheap embellishments of amateur biographers, Mr McKerrow sometimes misses general considerations which even exact scholars should investigate rather than ignore. For instance, if the painstaking commentator can spend so much ingenuity to persuade us that his author probably never visited Italy,—a fact of

little importance in appreciating his work,—why does he dismiss in one sentence the question of Elizabethan literary professionalism, which was the source and guiding power of Nashe's activity. On two occasions Mr McKerrow leaves research and takes to speculation, and in neither instance can we agree with him. It is perhaps inevitable that a book which supersedes all previous work on the subject should be reactionary. But iconoclasm is none the less misleading because it is pardonable. In the first case, though he proves that Nashe does not quote Rabelais, he fails to convince us that the French humanist had no influence on the Elizabethan, especially as he admits himself that Nashe read many books from which he did not happen to plagiarise, while some of his burlesque, especially in *Have with you to Saffron Walden*, is extremely like the extravagances of Rabelais. Mr McKerrow's other general speculation is devoted to the rehabilitation of the Harveys. Many students of literature, including the present writer, have long felt that Gabriel Harvey was not the vindictive and pedantic monster, whom some have represented him to be, and are grateful to Mr McKerrow for championing him. But it is surely going too far to assert that the quarrel chiefly arose from the 'ancient opposition between the old and the new, between servility and independence, between prejudice and the right of a man to that consideration which his abilities and achievements deserved. And it was the Harveys who stood for the future and Nashe for the past.' How could such have been the case if Gabriel 'was for some fifteen years, one of the most noteworthy and most widely known of the members of his University,' while Nashe had left the same university, apparently without a degree and with a bad record, and was now starving and scribbling in London, persecuted by the authorities, and striving to win in a disreputable profession the recognition which Harvey had gained at the great seat of learning? Mr McKerrow has admirably explained why the sons of the rope-maker should be over-sensitive to criticism, but whatever personal animosity Nashe felt, must in its origin have been akin to Heine's contempt for Professor Saalfeld of Göttingen.

Apart from these few differences of opinion, no student of literature can withhold his admiration for the commentator's industry and acumen. The whole edition is typical of the thoroughness and accuracy of contemporary scholarship since the appearance of the *Dictionary of National Biography* and the *New English Dictionary*. But sometimes one is surprised with the fear that if criticism develops much further along these lines, it may lose touch with the interests of life, and like the post-classical study of Vergil, evaporate amid minutiae and abstractions.

H. V. Routh.

Toronto.

The French Renaissance in England. An Account of the Literary Relations of England and France in the Sixteenth Century. By SIDNEY LEE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. xxiv+494 pp.

To those who have not made a special study of the literary indebtedness of England to France during the sixteenth century the magnitude and bulk of Mr Lee's imposing volume will no doubt come as a surprise. Accustomed as they have become to see the topic ignored or unceremoniously dismissed by the authors of authoritative manuals and histories on that period of English literature, they will wonder how and where Mr Lee has found the material to fill so many pages. On closer examination they will discover that one half roughly of the book is taken up with a rapid parallel exposition of French literature during the period concerned. The idea of pursuing the course of the two literatures side by side is not unhappy. An essential condition of success, however, is that the author should possess the rare equipment of a thorough knowledge of each literature. Mr Lee's knowledge of the literature of France during the sixteenth century is remarkable, to be sure, in one who does not claim to be a specialist, but for all that not invariably sound enough to stand the test he has imposed upon himself in that part of his work, which, moreover, could with advantage have been cut down to more modest dimensions, or still better entwined in the warp and woof of the main tissue. It may be urged in opposition and in extenuation that Mr Lee, having in mind the conscientious but rather dry investigation of Dr Upham, his predecessor in the same field, aimed above all things at writing an attractive work appealing to the general student of literature as well as to the scholar, and that to satisfy two very different palates he was constrained to present a varied banquet suited to both tastes. If such was his intention, he may justly claim to have succeeded. His agreeable and original style, as well as his scholarly researches in more than one dark recess of a subject which a few years ago was a barren waste, assured him a large measure of success from the first. But he deserves greater praise, for he is the first English scholar to show the way; and if he occasionally stumbles against hidden obstacles on the unexplored road, all honour is due to him for his lucid and reasoned presentment of a branch of comparative literature which, we venture to think, will in future compel the attention of all serious students of English literature.

The novelty of Mr Lee's topic demands a much more detailed criticism than can be here attempted. I will accordingly confine myself to the discussion of certain features of the picture which I happen to have examined more carefully, and point out on the way any errors of fact which may strike me.

Book I deals, in a general way, with the debt of Tudor culture to France. In this part of the work Charlanne (to whom acknowledgement is made in the preface) has evidently been the guide. Book II, which concerns us more directly, treats of French influence on English

literature (excluding Scottish literature) from 1500—1550, rather scantily as regards the period preceding Wyatt and Surrey. In speaking of Alain Chartier mention might have been made of the translation by Richard Ros of *La belle Dame sans mercy*, one of the French poet's most popular works, of which there are translations in several European languages, and also of the influence of his *Quadrilogue invectif*. The apocryphal story of the kiss was first printed by Jean Bouchet in his *Annales d'Aquitaine* (1524), and not by Estienne Pasquier, as Mr Lee states. The case for Lord Berners is well put on the whole, but the effect of the Burgundian 'rhétoriqueurs' on his style, which was worth notice, is neglected. On the other hand, the verse 'rhétoriqueurs' are credited with having influenced contemporary English literature to an extent hardly justified by facts. I can discover no evidence that Barclay's *Towre* was 'planned on the model' of Jean Le Maire's *Temple*. The same may be said of Le Maire's *L'Amant vert* and Skelton's *Speke, Parrot*. There is some similarity in the titles, and that is all. The 'jolting gallop' of Skelton's short metres is derived, rightly in my opinion, from similar exercises in Martial d'Auvergne, and in the farces and satires of the early sixteenth century, but I demur when Mr Lee says (p. 107) that Skelton's example was largely responsible for the vogue of short syllabled metres familiar to later generations of Tudor England. Skelton's prosaic doggerel is a very different thing from the tuneful lilting short lyric measures of the Elizabethans, and flowed from other channels. With regard to Hawes, though his allegorical machinery clearly represents the last phase of the Chaucerian school weakened by the continued imitation of diluted French models, no specific French model can be instanced for any of his works. In connexion with *The Pastime of Pleasure*, Mr Lee cites, tentatively, *Le Passe-temps de tout homme et de toute femme* (1480) of Guillaume Alexis, apparently because each composition bears the title 'pastime.' But the *Passe-temps* of Alexis is a fairly close translation of Innocent III's *De contemptu mundi*, and has nothing in common with the subsequent production of Hawes. Alexis cannot even claim to have given the vogue to the title 'Passe-temps'; it had been used several times before he elected to utilise it for one of his works. However Alexis was not unknown in England, and MM. Piaget and Picot have printed, in the admirable edition of the monk's poetry, an English translation of his *Debat de l'omme et de la femme*, issued by Wynkyn de Worde about 1525.

One of the most interesting and ingenious chapters in Mr Lee's book is the one entitled 'Marot and Alamanni: Wyatt and Surrey,' in which the author, basing his argument on the fact that Wyatt and Surrey were in Paris or its vicinity at the time when Clément Marot and Alamanni were poetically active there, attributes to their example the nature and character of much that is novel and exotic in the poetic output of Wyatt and Surrey. In this instance again I am unable to follow Mr Lee all the way. I fully accept the Italian influence on the two English poets (as early as 1815 Dr Nott had made that plain), but I cannot grant that Alamanni had any great share in it. Secondly

I am of opinion that the debt of Wyatt to Marot is very small; and that by minimising the extent of the French poet's Italian culture and ignoring one side of its development (p. 111), Mr Lee has attributed to his influence certain peculiarities of Wyatt's verse which are naturally explained by reference to Italian models. I may perhaps be allowed to state my reasons fully. Speaking of Surrey's innovation as the first English poet to use blank verse, Mr Lee, struck by the fact that Alamanni had already made large use of rhymeless verse in his *Opere Toscane*, concludes that there are many grounds for ranking Surrey among the Florentine exile's pupils. Though the *Opere Toscane* were not published till 1532—33, H. Hauvette (*Luigi Alamanni, Sa vie et son Œuvre*, Paris, 1903, pp. 215 sqq.) argues that he was the first to make use of blank verse in narrative poetry, on the ground that several of his compositions in *versi sciolti* (particularly the *Eclogues*) go back to the year 1519—20. This may be so. At any rate it remains true that several Italian compositions in blank verse existed in print before the publication of Alamanni's efforts in that direction. Not to mention Trissino's and Rucellai's attempts in the drama, Surrey had at his disposal the latter's *Le Api*, a long didactic poem in *versi sciolti*, on the pattern of the fourth book of the *Georgics*, completed in 1524, and published a few years later. Surrey could also have taken as his model the Italian translations in rhymeless verse of various books of the *Aeneid* published before he tried his hand at blank verse. It is also possible that Surrey invented blank verse himself on the basis of his studies in classical poetry. Moreover Alamanni's reputation as a writer of *versi sciolti* dates from the publication of his *Coltivazione*, issued in 1546 many years after the publication of the *Opere Toscane*. It is his only work in blank verse comparable in extent and general importance to Rucellai's *Le Api*. For that reason it is that Du Bellay (*Deffence*, Bk. II, chap. VII *in fine*) cites the 'non moins docte que plaisante Agriculture' of 'le Seigneur Loys Aleman'; and when he uses the expression 'de nostre tens' he is clearly alluding to the recent publication of the *Coltivazione*, and not to the priority or supremacy of Alamanni in that particular form of poetry. Mr Lee appears to me to have read into Du Bellay's casual remark a meaning which in my opinion it was never meant to contain. Du Bellay is the only member of the Pléiade to as much as mention the name of Alamanni—and that in quite a special connexion. All the evidence tends to show that in the eyes of the poets of the Pléiade he was a very unimportant person. Marot and his disciples are just as eloquently silent. His poetic effusions, though published on French soil with a complimentary preface to the French king, passed unnoticed. These considerations lead me to believe that Surrey was not actuated to undertake his attempt in rhymeless poetry by the earlier experiments, in widely different fields, of Alamanni. What is known of the life of Surrey confirms, I think, my conclusions. E. Bapst (*Deux Gentilhommes-Poètes de la cour de Henry VIII*, Paris, 1891, p. 181 sqq.) has established on documentary evidence that Surrey spent the winter

of 1532 and the spring and summer of 1533 with the French court, accompanying it in its various peregrinations about France. It was in the years 1532—33 that Alamanni published his *Opere Toscane*. But Bapst also proves satisfactorily that Surrey was born in 1518. Thus he was only fourteen at the time of his visit to the French court—a mere lad, intent on enjoying himself with the Earl of Richmond and the sons of Francis I, and very unlikely to take much notice of the literary activity of Marot or of Alamanni. In later years, when his poetical gifts had declared themselves (Surrey did not compose before 1540, as Courthope points out), we frequently come across him on French soil, in the functions of diplomat or military commander, but far from the court and capital, and bent on business which left little time for literary study. Surrey was an Italianate, but he sought his models in the pages of Italian poets of greater renown than the Florentine exile both as regards form and matter. He has not been shown to owe a tittle to the varied poetic baggage of Alamanni. The same is true of his supposed relation to Marot. We are thus forced to the conclusion that his figure at all events must be omitted from the picture. When Mr Lee comes to discuss Wyatt's debt to Alamanni he is on safer ground, thanks to the researches of Nott and his successors. However he makes a curious slip in stating that Wyatt's 'three satires on a courtier's life...are to a large extent paraphrases of Alamanni's satires.' One only (that dedicated to John Poins) owes anything to these; it obviously reflects Alamanni's twelfth satire ('O vi dirò poi che d' udir vi cale'). The two remaining satires are directly inspired by Horace. Wyatt used the Italian satiric metre (the *terza rima*) for all three, as he did also for his *Penitential Psalms*, which recall Alamanni's *Salmi Penitentiali* in metrical structure, but not in matter or spirit. In making use of the *terza rima* for his satires (written at Allington during the closing years of his life) Wyatt was merely adopting a well-established poetic form for satiric utterance, without special prompting from Alamanni. Regular poetic satire was as yet unknown in France and in England, and it is difficult to see what other metre an Italianate like Wyatt could have chosen. Wyatt's certain debt to Alamanni accordingly reduces itself to the imitation of one of his satires. As regards Alamanni's two hundred odd sonnets there is not the least ground for supposing that they attracted the attention of Surrey or of Wyatt. Few sonnets, it is true, had as yet been penned in France, but the two English poets found stimulus enough in the sonneteering activities of Petrarch and his more immediate disciples. It is in the lyric metrical experiments of Wyatt (here Surrey is made to raise no claim) more especially that Mr Lee discerns an influence of pure French stamp. He sees that unalloyed influence at work most pronouncedly in Wyatt's short-syllabled metres and their various intricacies, and also in his little six-line and eight-line poems which 'repeatedly catch the note of the sixains and huitains of Marot or of his rival, Melin de Saint-Gelais.' Mr Lee has been led astray by overlooking the important fact that Wyatt was a devoted

pupil of Serafino of Aquila and of the other poets of the Quattrocento, whose vogue during the first quarter of the sixteenth century was at least equal to that of Petrarch. Wyatt's huitains are nearly all constructed on the model (*abababcc*) of Serafino's *strambotti*; and the matter of at least six of them is taken straight from the pages of the poet of Aquila. The few single poems of six, seven, ten or twelve lines are merely metrical variations of the *strambotto* as practised by Serafino and his associates. But Serafino cultivated other popular forms besides this; he was equally deft in handling the rapid and dancing metres of the *barzeletta*. It is in the *barzelette* of Serafino and his followers that Wyatt found the pattern or the suggestion for the lively strophic metres of his lighter lyrics. In the same way as those of Serafino they convey the unmistakable impression of having been written to be sung. Their true lyric character is further attested by the frequent use of the refrain—a device much affected by Serafino and Poliziano in their *barzelette* and in some of their livelier canzoni. In fact one or two of Wyatt's refrains are borrowed directly from Serafino, as is also the trick of repeating the same word at the end of the line ('Hard of belief it doth appear, appear'; 'Claiming of you nothing of right, of right,' etc.). If the shorter and brisker lyric rhythms, and more especially the little six-line and eight-line poems of Wyatt occasionally catch the note of Marot or of Saint-Gelais it is because the two French poets likewise levied considerable loans on the same model as their English contemporary, as J. Vianey has recently shown. The resemblance in subject-matter between certain rondeaux of Wyatt and Marot, where it exists at all, is of such a general character that it is quite inconclusive; it is naturally explained by the fact that they both drew from the same source. The example quoted by Mr Lee (p. 124), in which the fortunes of a lover's heart form the main topic, is a case in point. The conceit employed both by Wyatt and Marot is typical of the poets of the Quattrocento; they positively revelled in the elaboration of such migrations of hearts from one bosom to another. Wyatt's rondeaux are in general very different from Marot's home-spun. There is no semblance of proof, as far as I can see, for the statement that 'Wyatt's refrains are clearly of Marot's invention.' Wyatt's use of the rondeau-form alone may be safely attributed to French example. The form was unknown in Italy, and is essentially a French creation. In his eagerness to fit Marot's rondeaux to those of Wyatt, Mr Lee writes that in the hands of the French poet (Marot) 'the length of the rondeau was sternly reduced to fifteen lines.' The facts are that Marot used the rondeau of twelve lines (called 'rondeau simple' in his day), as well, though not so frequently, as the rondeau of fifteen lines. I do not of course deny that Wyatt had read Marot. It would indeed be strange if he had not. A few passages (very few) in his poems afford proof that he had done so. One of the Englishman's sonnets, not quoted by Mr Lee ('I abide, and abide; and better abide'), is clearly a reflection of one of the Frenchman's charming chansons ('J'attends secours de ma seule pensée'). My point is that Mr Lee

has greatly exaggerated the indebtedness of Wyatt to Marot; and that such debt as exists dwindles to very little, both as regards form and matter, when exposed to a more searching light. In the case of Wyatt, as in the case of Surrey, I feel compelled to reject Mr Lee's verdict: 'They (Wyatt and Surrey) learned much of the poetic art of Italy from an Italian poet who was domiciled in their day in Paris and was bringing to French notice the new modes of poetic satire, of blank verse and the sonnet; while the English poets' debt to the indigenous poetry of France calls for fuller acknowledgement than has yet been rendered' (p. 110)[1].

Book III, devoted to a study of French influence on Elizabethan prose, I am constrained to pass over for want of space, with the observation that Mr Lee's treatment of Rabelais in England is less full than that of Dr Upham. The same remark holds good of the pages which deal with the effect of Montaigne's *Essays* on Elizabethan writers, particularly as regards Bacon. Probably E. Wolff's exhaustive study on Bacon's sources appeared too late to be utilized.

The subject of Book IV is the French influence in the Elizabethan lyric. It consists of about a hundred pages on various topics, many of doubtful relevance. The best chapter of Book IV, if not of the whole work, is the twelfth, on a theme which the author has already treated on more than one occasion: in the present instance he entitles his essay 'The Assimilation of the French Sonnet.' Next follows a chapter on Shakespeare and the French sonnet, in which Mr Lee strives to demonstrate that the 'thought and expression' of Shakespeare's sonnets 'occasionally resemble French effort closely enough to suggest that the process of assimilation wrought at times on Shakespeare's triumphant achievement in much the same way as on the mass of the sonneteering efforts of his day.' The proposition is improbable *a priori*; and the examples quoted by Mr Lee certainly do not lend to it any greater probability. I doubt whether Shakespeare had ever heard the name of Vauquelin de la Fresnaye, or of Gilles Durant, with whose strains Mr Lee also supposes him to have been acquainted in another chapter ('The Elizabethan Rendering of French Lyric Themes') which in its first part appears to me equally fanciful. A good deal could be said about what Mr Lee writes concerning the metric of the Pléiade, but a few points only can be noted. His account of the development of the metrical scheme of the Pléiade sonnet (p. 264) is incorrect; and he certainly should not have written that a 'common type of tercet in Pléiade sonnets presented four lines alternately rhymed and a closing couplet with a third rhyme *cdc, dee*.' The sonnet with a concluding couplet was attempted by Marot, Saint-Gelais and Peletier du Mans, but is never found in the work of the Pléiade. It is misleading to say that Ronsard 'tried his hand at sixty-three metres or strophes' (p. 202), since he essayed more than twice that number. Nor was the four-lined

[1] The long supposed debt of Wyatt to Saint-Gelais (which dies so hard) is admitted by Mr Lee not to be due.

stanza of Tennyson's *In Memoriam* an innovation of his school (p. 202). Marot, and a host of French poets before him, had made it popular. On page 238 Mr Lee states that 'most of Ronsard's odes have the same heading ("non mesurée") by way of warning that he refused to write in "vers mesurés" in accordance with the classical scheme of quantitative prosody.' It is hardly necessary to correct the blunder. Mr Bullen, and Mr George Wyndham with more assurance, have already suggested that the metrical debt of the Elizabethans to the Pléiade is more considerable than is generally believed. Mr Lee's endeavour to press the suggestion to definite and specific conclusions can hardly be said to be successful. Some of the supposed French parallels which he instances in connexion with certain Elizabethan strophic rhythms could be replaced with more effect by exact parallels. Even then all of them are such common types of lyric stanzas that nothing would be proved. It is only when a particular strophic scheme marked by unquestioned originality, and known to be peculiar to the Pléiade, is found in the pages of an Elizabethan that any safe inference may be drawn. A few such are to be found in the *Odes* of Barnabe Barnes. Another of the same kind by Lodge is parodied in *Tarlton's News out of Purgatory*. Drayton was no doubt aware that the ode had been lifted into sonority and splendour by Ronsard and his companions, yet he makes no mention of his French contemporaries in the preface of 1606; nor can I discern any sign that he 'repeatedly accepts a French cue for both topic and metre' of his *Odes*, or share the view that 'Ronsard's Anacreontic enthusiasm for the rose...is the obvious source of Drayton's Anacreontic ode in praise of the same flower.' Mr Lee thinks that little doubt is possible that the English controversy concerning quantitative verse is a pale reflection of the French. Probably he is right, yet it is at least worth notice that Claudio Tolomei's earlier attempt in Italy is the only one recorded in any of the Elizabethan critical essays.

Book V deals with Huguenot influence in England, and contains chapters on the poetry of D'Aubigné and Du Bartas, and on the latter's Elizabethan disciples, among whom Donne is included on what appears very scanty evidence.

Book VI, which concludes the work, is devoted to French influence on Elizabethan drama. Apart from the efforts of Sidney and his friends to purify the native drama and to mould it on conventional classical lines, no real case of French influence is here made out, except perhaps in some of the 'humbler constituent elements of English drama' (plots, stories, etc.), which, in many cases, may just as well have come from Italy as from France.

Although, in this rapid review we have felt bound to reject more than one of Mr Lee's conclusions, we heartily recommend his valuable work to all who are interested in comparative literature, and feel sure that after reading it they will not hesitate to endorse his closing words: 'None who compare the two literatures are likely to question the justice of the conclusion that a knowledge of the literary activity of con-

temporary France is essential to a sound conception or estimate of the literary forces at work in England throughout the period of the Tudor sovereigns' rule, from the accession of King Henry VII to the death of Queen Elizabeth, and even through the generation beyond.'

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

The Plays and Poems of George Chapman: The Tragedies. Edited by T. M. PARROTT. London: Routledge. 1910. 8vo. xiv + 730 pp.

The need of a satisfactory edition of Chapman's plays has often been felt by students, and the work of which we have here the first instalment seems likely in a great measure to supply what was wanted. Of Chapman's dramatic works there are, as is well known, two modern editions, that published by Pearson in 1873, and that published by Chatto and Windus in 1874, the latter edited by R. H. Shepherd, who is generally thought to have been the editor also of the previous edition. Shepherd's text is not so bad as it has sometimes been said to be[1], but the edition nevertheless is a most unsatisfactory one. The editor gives no account whatever of the principles on which he has worked, and his alterations of the text of the quartos are not in any way indicated to the reader. Professor Parrott is the first to give us a text of Chapman's tragedies as a whole[2] on which we can rely, that is to say, accompanied by full information with regard to the authorities on which it is based and notes of all the variations from them which are admitted by the editor. In addition to this he supplies us with a full account of each play, including a good deal of very sound æsthetic criticism, and a large number of explanatory and illustrative notes, the last a very desirable adjunct to an edition of Chapman. He has not, of course, solved all the difficulties of textual criticism and interpretation which confront an editor of Chapman, but he has at least faced them courageously, and his attempts, though sometimes unsuccessful, will be of use to future workers. Some of the preliminary studies for this edition have been published in the *Modern Language Review*, as for example, the editor's investigation of the date of *Bussy d'Ambois* (Vol. III, pp. 126—140), and his notes on the text of the Byron plays (Vol. IV, pp. 40—64).

As regards questions of date and authorship the editor's judgment is usually sound. His reasons, stated in the *Modern Language Review*, for dating *Bussy d'Ambois* later than the death of Elizabeth have certainly considerable weight, but in this edition he has confined

[1] A good many unnecessary alterations are introduced, but in several instances Shepherd's emendations are good, and must be accepted: e.g. *Tragedy of Chabot*, i, 1. 187; ii, 2. 52; ii, 2. 119. This play had previously been edited by Dyce, but did not appear in the collected edition of 1873.

[2] Of *Bussy d'Ambois* and *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* we have had satisfactory editions from Professor Boas.

himself to stating his conclusions, and the reader has no means of judging of their validity except by reference to the above-named article. In the notes, however, attention is called to the least weighty of the arguments, that which is based upon the mention of leap-year (i, 2. 82). It is really time that an effective protest should be made against the kind of reasoning of which this is an example. The author has occasion to introduce into his dialogue a jest of which the point, such as it is, turns upon the assumption that the action of the play takes place in a leap-year; but he cannot do this (it is assumed) except on one of two conditions, either that the action which is presented took place historically in a leap-year, or that it is leap-year at the time when the play is being produced. This is no burlesque of Professor Parrott's argument. 'Only one of two things can have suggested this jest to the author, either that it was a leap-year when the historical Bussy first appeared at court, or that it was a leap-year when the play was being composed for presentation[1].' Of course this is only a repetition of reasoning with which we are familiar. *Romeo and Juliet* must have been produced in 1591, because the Nurse says, ''Tis since the earthquake now eleven years,' and there was a noticeable earthquake in 1580: *The Old Law* must have been produced in 1599, because that is the assumed date of the action represented. (By the same rule it must have been first acted on the 11th of Hecatombaion, for nothing else could have suggested that date to the mind of an Elizabethan dramatist.) The leap-year argument is not essential, however, and we may reasonably accept for *Bussy d'Ambois*, as we have it in the first quarto, a date not earlier than 1604, though possibly the play may have existed earlier in a different form. As regards the revision of which the result is given in the second quarto, the editor is probably right in connecting it with the production of *The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois*, and this may reasonably be dated 1610 or 1611. *The Tragedy of Chabot* is regarded by the editor as the result of a thorough revision by Shirley in 1634 of a play composed by Chapman soon after 1611, at which date appeared the earliest edition of Pasquier's *Recherches de la France* which can have been used as its source. Certainly it is improbable that there should have been an actual collaboration between Chapman and Shirley, and it is desirable, if possible, to bring this play into connection with the preceding series of dramas founded on French history. It is shown by the editor that there is a large amount of mixed work in the play, suggesting revision rather than collaboration, and that the contributions of Shirley may be traced in at least eight of the eleven scenes. Professor Parrott rightly refuses to allow that Chapman had any hand either in *Alphonsus Emperor of Germany* or in *Revenge for Honour*; and this being so, it might be considered reasonable that he should have excluded these plays from his edition, or at least printed them in an appendix, with a less elaborate apparatus of notes.

[1] *Modern Language Review*, Vol. III, p. 131.

The textual questions dealt with in this volume are often of considerable interest. In such remarks as have to be made upon them it will be convenient to follow the order of the plays.

Bussy d'Ambois, ii, 2. The editor is perhaps right in omitting at the beginning of this scene the fifty lines which are dropped in the second quarto, but hardly for the reason given. They are certainly not without dramatic significance. The supposed introduction of Montsurry in the preceding scene, as a spectator to whom no speech is assigned, does not in the least render them useless and is itself dramatically absurd.

The Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois, i, 1. 285. Professor Parrott objects to read 'Ere you were born' for 'Ere you're born,' because the latter reading 'shows the syncopated first foot common in Chapman,' and similarly in iv, 5. 105, v, 5. 5, where he will not read 'to the Court' for 'to' th Court,' 'opens' for 'opes,' in order not to get rid of this feature. (In *Bussy d'Ambois*, iii, 2. 1 he even assumes that the omission of 'my' in the second quarto is deliberate, with a view to metrical effect.) But this characteristic of Chapman's verse is purely imaginary: it cannot be shown that the author ever intentionally wrote such lines.

i, 1. 361. The parenthesis of the quarto is certainly right: 'never so thriftily' must of course belong to 'swearing.'

i, 1. 379. The alteration of 'friend' to 'brother' ought not to be accepted from Shepherd. In Elizabethan English 'friend' may be used of a near kinsman.

Byron's Conspiracy, ii, 1. 51. The alteration of 'service' to 'servant' is too hastily admitted. The meaning is 'My best powers in that and in all things vow service to you.'

ii, 1. 105. The emendation 'affirme' for 'assume' might well have been accepted from Mr P. A. Daniel, to whom are due also the excellent corrections in ll. 122 and 149.

iii, 1. 16. 'Tun'd in to Chaos' can hardly be right.

iii, 2. 224. 'feral' for 'femall' is a good correction: the context is quite appropriate.

iii, 3. 84. The editor says, 'This line lacks a syllable and is quite unintelligible.' (He has forgotten the theory about 'syncopated first foot.') Read 'Out, remedy of pity.' The sense is fairly clear: 'remedy of pity' means, as Mr Daniel says, 'reason for discarding pity,' and is quite in Chapman's style.

iv, 1. 160. The editor should print 'Dolphin' here, and not modernise to 'Dauphin,' thus losing, or at least blunting, the point of the expression.

Byron's Tragedy, i, 1. 123. Shepherd's emendation 'overwatch'd' might well be accepted.

iii, 1. 124. The explanation given does not fit the text, which probably needs some correction.

iii, 2. 31. 'He will not come' should be given either as an exclamation or a question. This is clear from the context, especially l. 56, in spite of the different form which the remark has in the chronicle.

iii, 2. 44. There should be a note on 'dis[m]ay'd.'

iv, 2. 172 ff. The conversation of Henry with Auvergne is of course aside.

iv, 2. 294. The alteration here proposed is not convincing. The intransitive use of 'overthrow' is hardly to be found later than Middle English, and the falling over of a pageant because it was too large can hardly have been a familiar spectacle. We must be content with the more homely similitude of the quartos, which perhaps may be illustrated from the common saying 'Herculis cothurnos aptare infanti.'

The Tragedy of Chabot, i, 1. 206. 'In' for 'I' is no doubt right.

ii, 2. 51. 'arm'd,' as suggested in the note, might well have been adopted in the text. (The quarto reading is 'ariu'd,' not 'arriv'd.')

ii, 2. 87. The reading 'nor honour' is a good one, but it was first suggested by Brereton (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, Vol. III, p. 67).

ii, 3. 103. The reading proposed by the editor is an excellent one and should have been adopted in the text.

iii, 2. 169 ff. The editor remarks that the syntax of this is unusually difficult, but neither he nor any other critic has perceived, apparently, what the solution of the difficulty is. It seems to me almost certain that the speeches of the Proctor-General and of Chabot have been by some means disarranged in the quarto. Chabot's speech is wrongly broken after l. 146 by the interpolation here of what should have been the conclusion of the Proctor's oration (ll. 147—168). If this be placed where it ought to go, after l. 116, little difficulty remains. We get rid of the very unnatural interruption at l. 146, and Chabot's speech at this point will read,

> Only beseeching all your learned judgments,
> Equal and pious conscience, to weigh
> The variety and wonder now presented
> To your most noble notice and the world's,
> That all my life etc.

This simplifies the syntax very much, though it does not entirely reduce it to correctness, and gives a proper connection also for 'And then consider' in l. 178.

Cæsar and Pompey, i, 2. 193. 'To take' is of course right. Examples of the construction are very frequent: e.g. Shakspeare, *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, ii, 6. 1 ff. and ii, 7. 80.

i, 2. 288. I do not know what the editor means by his note, p. 667. Chapman of course wrote 'Great Agamemnon or the king of men' with reference to the Homeric *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν*.

v, 1. 51. 'Left' seems a very probable emendation for 'Lost.'

The explanatory notes are often valuable, but leave a good many difficulties unsolved, as the editor would readily admit. The remarks which I have to make upon them shall be brief. In *Bussy d'Ambois*, v, 4. 135 ff., Professor Parrott can attach no definite meaning to the imagery, which, no doubt, is somewhat obscure. But Pindus and Ossa (not 'Pelion and Ossa') piled with their snows upon the hero's heart stand for the weight of cold with which death was oppressing him, and

which might have altogether benumbed his being, but that the red beams of his sun melted the snow into torrents of bitterness. In the *Revenge of Bussy*, iii, 2. 107, 'No time occurs to kings' is a translation of the legal maxim, 'Nullum tempus occurrit regi,' that is, 'No lapse of time impairs the king's rights.' Finally, the concluding lines of *Chabot*, which are given up by the editor as meaningless, may nevertheless be explained:

> Kings, they say,
> Die not or starve succession: Oh, why
> Should that stand firm, and kings themselves despair
> To find their subject still in the next heir?

That is, 'Kings can find successors always to themselves, but cannot always find a successor to such a subject as this.'

Let me conclude by saying that this edition of Chapman's tragedies is on the whole a very valuable contribution to scholarship, and that the volume containing the comedies will be looked for with much interest[1].

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

The Authorship of 'Timon of Athens.' By E. H. Wright. New York: Columbia University Press. 1910. 8vo. viii + 104 pp.

Timon of Athens has hardly received sufficient attention hitherto. Mr Wright has collected the results of previous critics, and with their help reconsidered from the beginning all the general problems connected with the play. The book is a useful one.

With regard to the sources, besides Plutarch he finds only the old play of Timon (or, no doubt, some lost source of that play) necessary. Lucian's dialogue may have been used. Mr Wright's method is to divide up the play roughly on aesthetic and technical grounds, and then, working on that division, to assign to Shakespeare and the 'other author' as far as possible their own shares in writing and plot-construction, and to solve the problem of priority. Principally from considerations of style and metre he gives Shakespeare more than most previous critics. In only two passages, the last half of i, 1 and the prose parts of iii, 6, does he find it impossible to feel at all certain. Some of the ascriptions towards the end of iv, 3 on grounds of style and matter are not very convincing; and if the passages in this scene attributed to each had not been lumped together for the purposes of the 'metrical table' some contradictory results would have been reached.

The division thus made and every consideration of the play lead Mr Wright to accept Shakespeare's priority. This is rendered even more certain by the conclusions which he arrives at before the end of the book. But in any case this view, which most critics accept

[1] There are a good many trifling misprints scattered about the volume, which should be corrected in a future issue.

nowadays, is probably correct. By a series of ingenious combinations and inferences, and by assuming that Shakespeare's play and the additions are each self-dependent, Mr Wright works out a minutely exact division of the play and an account of the activities of the interpolator. It is a clever piece of work, and the general view of the way in which the second hand worked is illuminating and persuasive. Neither the details of the proof, however, nor the assumptions, make the actual argument conclusive. It remains the most plausible hypothesis.

The insertions of the second hand, according to Mr Wright, were largely for stage requirements,—more farce, a banquet, a masque, and so forth. Also he put in more 'dunning,' to make Timon's motives clearer, and the scene of Alcibiades' banishment to explain the crusade against Athens. There are two points on which Mr Wright builds up his detailed theory about the interpolations, to answer most of the difficulties in *Timon of Athens*. The first is an amplification of Fleay's argument about Ventidius. Shakespeare meant to show Ventidius, whom Timon ransoms from prison in the first Act, as the crowning example of ingratitude. The interpolator, having opened the banquet-scene with Ventidius offering repayment, had to cut out the later scene of his refusing Timon, and merely refer to it, substituting the ingratitude of Sempronius and some others. To lead up to this he introduced into the middle of II, 2, where Timon sends his servants to borrow money from Lucius and Lucullus, the name of Sempronius, together with a reference to Lucullus, and Timon's hunting expedition, which joins up with I, 2, also an interpolation. Incidentally this turned the passage to prose. By this explanation minor difficulties about the number and names of the servants are cleared up, and the requirements of style which would give the Lucius and Lucullus scenes to Shakespeare and the Sempronius scene to the second hand are satisfied. It is a theory that may be true; and it fits in well enough with the general lines of the dual authorship: but the evidence that it all happened in this way is far less strong than Mr Wright believes. In the first place it is absurd to think that the offer of Ventidius to repay at the beginning of II, 1 makes it impossible to show Ventidius refusing Timon's appeal later. It is merely a subtler rendering of character. An offer to repay the very rich and generous Timon was a safe one. It was sure to be rejected. Later, he was poorer; and then the part of baseness was to refuse. Nor is the presence of ten lines of prose in the middle of II, 2 so startling. It is perfectly natural that Timon should break off to give his servants directions in prose, and then continue his verse conversation; and Mr Wright's surgery restores rather a crippled verse passage.

> Commend me to their loves, and I am proud, say,
> That my occasions...

is surely a very Fletcherian line for Shakespeare. The arguments which Mr Wright uses against the theory that the whole prose bit is an interpolation are also weak, and can mostly be avoided by making the

cut in a different place. The rest depend on the assumption that Shakespeare's part of the play was complete in itself, and has all survived,—an assumption which we have no right to make.

The other chief point concerns Alcibiades. Mr Wright thinks that the banishment scene was inserted, to give Alcibiades a motive for warring upon Athens, by the interpolator, who missed the point; and that what we want is 'that Timon's claim on Alcibiades and Timon's service to the thankless state be more conspicuous.' His first point is true enough; but he does not quite succeed in showing that no reason is needed for the action of Alcibiades besides his affection for Timon. The comparison with Fortinbras is not a very good one: Alcibiades is much more central. And in making out his case Mr Wright is led to exaggerate the closeness of the connexion between Timon and Alcibiades which is indicated in the play.

In many ways the last part of the book is the best, where the relations between Shakespeare and the second hand are summed up, the present state of the play accounted for, and the real requirements of the plot suggested. The general lines of all this, as Mr Wright puts them, seem to be correct.

The author writes well and clearly. A certain number of the details, as has been suggested, are unsatisfactory, and the assumptions are often too simple. But this is probably the best account of the play that we have. The personality of the second hand is as dark as ever, and as unimportant. How Fleay can have imagined that he detected the feverish and brilliant style of Tourneur, it is impossible to see.

R. C. Brooke.

Cambridge.

Milton's Paradise Lost. Edited by A. W. Verity. Cambridge: University Press. 1910. 8vo. lxxii + 750 pp.

Mr Verity's edition of *Paradise Lost* is a careful and scholarly piece of work. The brief sketch of the poet's life, which forms part of the Introduction, if it adds nothing to our knowledge of the facts, contains more than one happy phrase which draws attention to the relation between Milton's character and training and his poetry. 'The world,' says Mr Verity, 'has known many greater scholars in the technical, limited sense...but few men, if any, who have mastered more things worth mastering in art, letters, and scholarship,' and the distinction is apt and illuminating. Again, in dealing with that long period devoted to political controversy, he has the courage to oppose those who lament these years as irretrievable waste: 'It may fairly be contended that had Milton elected in 1639 to live the scholar's life apart from "the action of men," *Paradise Lost*, as we have it, or *Samson Agonistes*, could never have been written. Knowledge of life and human nature, insight into the problems of men's motives and emotions, grasp of the broader issues of human tragedy, all these were essential to the author of an

epic poem; they could only be obtained through commerce with the world.' It is to be regretted that Mr Verity did not expand this still further, and illustrate more fully Milton's knowledge of human nature, and the niceties of his treatment of character; except for an occasional hint—such as the note on the Council of the Fallen Angels (II, 309)—he does little to prove his assertion; and yet in the face of those critics who still maintain that Milton 'knew human nature only in the gross,' it is well worth enforcing. It is also somewhat surprising to find a modern critic quoting with apparent approval Dryden's complaint 'that Milton saw nature through the spectacles of books,' and calling no attention to such exquisite passages as the description of evening after a stormy day, in Bk. II, ll. 488—95. It is true that in a note on Bk. IX, ll. 445—54, Mr Verity somewhat coldly allows that Milton was 'a true lover of Nature,' but he goes on to say that the poet who dwells with delight on

The smell of grain or tedded grass or kine,

on 'drooping plant and dropping tree,' is not 'minutely accurate.' The introductory essay on the sources of *Paradise Lost* is admirably clear and sane. Due allowance is made for every possible influence which can have affected Milton, without the assumption that every chance resemblance implies deliberate plagiarism. The notes are full, and contain abundant references to the work of former critics, and also to passages from other poets both ancient and modern, whose works may serve to illustrate a point or make an interesting comparison. The beginner will find this edition a storehouse of information, and those who know Milton well will find much to interest them.

G. E. Hadow.

Cirencester.

The Oxford Book of Ballads. Chosen and edited by Arthur Quiller-Couch. Oxford: University Press. 1910. 8vo. xxiv + 871 pp.

The ballad-editor's dilemma is between scientific collectivism and literary eclecticism; for the fact is that the ballads are not—or at least were never meant to be—literature. Let him who shies at so plain a statement pause to investigate the true meaning of the word 'literature,' and to contrast it with the true meaning of the word 'lore'; and he will perceive that the ballads are properly communicable only by word of mouth, not to be stereotyped in hard letters and cold lead. The written or printed ballad is an 'animula vagula,' as it were, 'in corpore vili.' It is not easy nowadays for us to assume the right position towards the ballads—which, it may be, has gone past recovery; yet while the editor of a play extant in four folios and six quartos is expected to record all his variants, the editor of ballads may go browse and choose what pleases him most. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch has the advantage of a precedent set by Sir Walter Scott and William Allingham; he has also the *variorum* edition of Francis James Child;

and the result is thoroughly satisfactory to everybody who likes the ballads and does not care about their history.

All the best of Child's three hundred and five are here, some of them in more than one form: there are three versions of *Young Bekie*, and *Lady Isabel and the Elf-Knight* and *May Colvin*, and *Earl Brand* and *The Douglas Tragedy*, are two pairs of variants. We are glad to see the bold inclusion of *King Arthur and King Cornwall* and the *Marriage of Sir Gawain*, from their sadly-mutilated originals in the Percy Folio. Here and there we may cavil at errors of commission or omission in the editing: the hand of the censor has fallen on *Glasgerion*, *Young Hunting*, and *Brown Robyn's Confession* (the only ballad of the Virgin's miracles we possess); Percy's garbled version of the *Boy and the Mantle* is given in place of the delightful original in the Folio MS., and the broadside version of the *Lord of Lorn* instead of the Folio one; *Little Musgrave and Lady Barnard* opens—I think illegitimately—with the refrain of the *Bonny Birdy*; there is a better version of the *Great Silkie of Sule Skerry*, and the one given need not have been altered in the sixth verse; and *Judas* stops very suddenly and quite inexplicably before it has got under weigh. The *Lyke-Wake Dirge* has every right to be included, and it is encouraging to see 'Fire and fleet' adopted in place of 'Fire and sleet.' Towards the end of the book several poems that are not ballads, and some that are frankly folk-songs, are included. *The Spanish Lady's Love* is very like the best of Deloney's work, which to my mind is very like the worst of Deloney's work.

Book IV—'early carols and ballads of Holy Writ'—is most interesting, though some of the poems are certainly not ballads. *The Falcon* and *Jolly Wat* seem to have come out of *Early English Lyrics*; if they did not, Sir Arthur is to be congratulated on correcting the order of the stanzas in the latter; and if they did, he may be asked why he did not also include the modern traditional variant of the *Falcon*, which would seem to have a better claim to a place among ballads than the fifteenth-century lyric. *The Angel Gabriel*, *The Three Kings*, and *The Innocents* are not true ballads; but all the other (too few) English traditional carols are here except *The Bitter Withy*. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch might have added this, and improved the texts of other carols, if he had searched recent numbers of the *Journal of the Folk-Song Society*. Would he not like to know of another genuine verse belonging to the carol of *The Seven Virgins*? In return, he should be pressed for a plain statement about his version of *I Saw Three Ships*: the verse about St Michael and St John is only known to me in Ritson's careless quotation from what he calls 'a musical medley' (i.e. Forbes' *Cantus*), and there the form of the stanza is different.

The volume, uniform with the *Oxford Book of English Verse*, needs no bibliographical comment, except that the end-papers, maps of the Border, are a happy idea carried out more picturesquely than usefully.

F. Sidgwick.

London.

The Anglo-Saxon Charms. By Felix Grendon. Reprinted from the *Journal of American Folk Lore*, April—June, 1909. (No. lxxxiv, pp. 105—237.) 4to.

The claims of Mr Grendon's monograph may best be stated in his own terms: 'No complete and separate edition of the Anglo-Saxon charms has yet been published, nor has any interpretative work been issued which covers the field....The present publication aims to furnish a detailed treatment of the subject. All the Anglo-Saxon metrical incantations are presented in the text, as well as all prose charms with vernacular or gibberish formulas; while exorcisms with Christian liturgical formulas, and Old English recipes involving charm practices, are represented by typical specimens.'

Mr Grendon's 'detailed treatment' observes limits which he does not indicate, but which are suggested by the publication of his study in a journal of folk-lore. The difficult problems presented by the metre of the charms are not even noticed, and the language is dismissed with the occasional recognition of an Anglian form. The investigation is confined to the matter of the charms, to interpretation and illustration; and within these limits the volume is interesting and valuable. It contains the text of sixty-two charms, with parallel translations and textual footnotes, a very readable introduction (pp. 105—159), a bibliography and list of charms not included, and notes, explanatory and illustrative, which sin pleasantly on the side of brevity.

In the Introduction, Mr Grendon collects much interesting material, but he does not completely succeed in organizing it. The Introduction is divided into three sections—(1) General Characteristics, (2) Classification of Charms, (3) Christian Elements in the Charms. In the third section, and only there, phenomena are grouped according to their causes. Arrangement of the whole material on this plan would have saved repetition and confusion. If the charms were classified according to fundamental ideas, their general characteristics might be elucidated in the course of the classification. Instead, we are given a loose catalogue of characteristics (p. 110), without any estimate of their relative importance; and a classification of the charms (p. 123) on a shifting basis, partly according to their aim, partly according to the accompanying ceremonial. Clear definition thus becomes impossible; Mr Grendon's group A (Exorcisms of diseases, etc.) cannot be definitely separated from group B (Herbal Charms); and most of the Charm Remedies forming group E fall under B or under D (Amulet Charms). Still more unsatisfactory is the classification of characteristics: '(1) Narrative Introduction; (2) Appeal to a superior spirit; (3) The writing or pronouncing of potent names or letters; (4) Methods of dealing with disease-demons; (5) The exorcist's boast of power; (6) Ceremonial directions to patient and exorcist; (7) The singing of incantations on parts of the body and on other objects; (8) Statement of time for performance of rites; (9) Sympathy and the association

of ideas; (10) Minor superstitious practices.' Here (2) and (3) overlap; (4) trespasses on all the other sections; (7) and (8) are subheadings of (6); and (9) is the fundamental characteristic which explains (1) and parts of most other sections. Except in so far as it falls under (2) and (3), Naming is omitted. Finally, among 'minor superstitious practices' are mentioned some ceremonies clearly belonging to main types. The ceremonial recommended *Wiδ feos lyre* (A 15)—to light three candles and to pour the melted wax on the beast's hoof-prints —is sympathetic. The 'running water' charms, though doubtless recalling the connection between streams and beneficent spirits, aim either at transfer (usually) or at sanctification by contact. The last idea, rather than that of transfer suggested by Mr Grendon, underlies the Beetle Charm *Wiδ wambewœrce* (C 2), probably a survival of beetle-worship, of which, as Mr Grendon's note reminds us, Grimm found traces among Teutonic peoples (*Teutonic Mythology*, trans. Stallybrass, p. 691 ff.). I do not know any example of *indirect* transfer, such as Mr Grendon here infers. Another misconception, several times repeated, relates to 'rinde seo þe cymδ of neorxnawonge,' recommended in E 9 as a remedy against all poisons. Mr Grendon comments on the quaintness of this description, which he takes literally. Much more probably 'rind from Paradise' is merely a name for some eastern or southern drug (cf. myrrh and frankincense E 4, E 14 etc.), hard to get, as the scribe remarks. Nor can we accept the suggestion that there is a mythological reference in the recommendation to a warrior to eat young swallows before a fight (p. 137): Mr Grendon's tentative alternative explanation is certainly the right one; the aim is direct acquisition of the swallow's agility. Numerous examples of similar customs are quoted by Dr A. C. Haddon in his excellent little book *Magic and Fetishism*—a book which, in spite of its modest popular form, deserves to be added to Mr Grendon's bibliography.

Distinctly the best section of the Introduction is that dealing with Christian influences. In his account of the interaction of Christian and pagan ideas, Mr Grendon shows that he can sympathetically reconstruct the psychological processes underlying the literary product, and his treatment is most luminous. In the other sections of his work, he merely presents phenomena with something of amused aloofness. His imagination does not requicken the conception of the world from which sprang the charms, the conception natural to minds unprotected and unfettered by knowledge, contemplating a world in which the supernatural and the natural, the marvellous and the commonplace, formed adjacent territories in daily experience.

The texts are careful, and in doubtful passages orthodox. The translations skilfully preserve the middle way between uncouth literalness and too great freedom. Some criticisms of detail may be given here; other suggestions, too controversial for a review, I reserve for separate treatment.

In the best-known of all the charms, *Wiδ fœrstice* (A 1) Mr Grendon translates 'linde' (in the line 'Stod under linde, under leohtum scylde')

by 'linden,' and comments (p. 117), 'the sufferer is directed to seek shelter under linden-trees.' 'Lind' here of course means the linden-wood shield (cp. Bosworth-Toller, 'lind,' II).

The well-known charm *Wiδ ymbe* (A 4) is probably to be used on the occasion of bees swarming, to keep the swarm near the desired spot, 'wiδ δa micelan mannes tungan,' in spite of the spell which another man might make to tempt them away; not, as Grendon translates, 'to stop bees from swarming.' The second ceremonial direction, 'Forweorp ofer greot þonne hi swirman,' establishes this interpretation, already given or assumed by several editors. 'Wiδ' in a charm title varies in meaning, like modern 'for'; it most commonly carries the idea of cure, but may also signify occasion or connexion, as above, or prevention. Probably we have the last meaning in the charm *Wiδ corn* (A 7), 'þis mæg horse wiδ δon þe him biδ corn on þa fet'; which may mean, as Mr Grendon thinks, 'This will cure a horse if it should have corns on its feet,' but more probably 'This avails for a horse against his having a corn,' 'this will keep a horse from having a corn.' Similarly *Wiδ feos nimunge* (A 16) is to *prevent* the theft of cattle, as is clearly shown by the opening sentence and by lines 13—19. This charm would be said on leaving cattle at pasture; contrast A 15, A 21, A 22, which aim at the recovery of stolen cattle.

It may be noted that the charm *Æcerbot* (A 13) falls into two distinct sections; ll. 4—39, for pasture land, l. 40 to the end for ploughed land. The qualification 'þe on þæm lande sy gewesen' (l. 9) probably extends to 'ælcre namcuδre wyrte'; for the point of the charm lies in the sanctification of samples, which are also symbols, of every desired thing already produced on the land in question (cf. ll. 11, 12). (On p. 155 the mistaken omission of the qualification is extended to cattle and trees also.) Immediately below, 'drype' probably applies, not to holy water alone, but to the liquid concocted of the ingredients prescribed in lines 4—9, including holy water; a liquid symbolizing all things desired from the fields. This gives point to the formula 'Crescite et multiplicamini,' etc., which would scarcely be addressed to the mere sod. In l. 31, it is straining the freedom of translation to render '[ic bidde] δa soþan sancta Marian' by 'the just and saintly Mary'; and two lines later 'þæt ic mote þis gealdor...toþum ontynan' is better translated, as usually, 'that I may utter this charm' (referring to the charm which is being spoken) than as Mr Grendon gives it 'that I this spell may with my teeth dissolve' (referring to an evil spell supposed to rest on the land). The next incantation, beginning 'Erce, Erce, Erce, eorδan modor, geunne δe se alwalda, ece drihten, æcera wexendra' cannot be strictly described as 'a Pagan address to Mother Earth, beseeching her to bless the fields' (p. 155). The pagan element is doubtless present, but the Christian elements have transformed it, not merely engulfed it, as indeed is the case throughout this carefully elaborated and consciously artistic charm. In l. 81 of the same charm, the translation of 'corna gehwylc' by 'all our grain' scarcely brings out the full meaning—'every kind of grain,' cf. 'ælces cynnes melo' in l. 73.

Mr Grendon blunders seriously in A 24, l. 15, translating 'sing þis ofer þam drence and þam gewrite' 'Sing this over the drink and recite the following writing.' Of course 'þam gewrite' is coordinate with 'þam drence.' This mistake leads to further confusion in the translation of ll. 28 f., and in the interpretation of the charm as a whole. By a minor slip the MS. reading 'scriptura' is corrected to 'scripturæ' in l. 31, but allowed to stand in l. 17.

The translation of B 3, ll. 12—14, may also be questioned; it should be 'Make (the three roots) into a drink (as follows): boil them three times in milk, pouring in holy water three times.' Again, Mr Grendon takes 'hine' (l. 15) to refer to 'drenc'; if it were so, we should probably again have 'hine' instead of 'ðone drenc' in l. 16. More probably 'Sing on Paternoster...deo' applies to the drink, and all that follows, to the patient. The introduction of 'hine,' referring to the patient, suggests a subject for 'drince' (l. 16). For similar chants over the patient cf. A 2, 5, 11, 17, 20, 23 etc.; for signs marked round the patient and on his limbs cf. A 12, 24; and probably the latter ceremonial is to be understood at the end of A 17, accompanying the formula 'Crux Matheus,' etc. In B 4, l. 57, we note the slip 'poison' instead of 'disease' to translate 'adle.'

Vowel quantities are wrongly marked in several cases, e.g. A 1, l. 25, 'þe' for 'þē'; A 14, l. 24, 'scēote' for 'sceote'; C 5, l. 1, 'hrēfn' for 'hrefn.' In metre, too, Mr Grendon makes some slips. The worst is his re-arrangement of A 14, ll. 25—9, where he completely spoils the verse. If, as he thinks, it were desirable to cancel 'hand ofer heafod' after 'beo,' which is most questionable, Ettmüller's division would be the correct one: 'Biddu ealle bliðum mode / þæt me beo Matheus helm, Marcus byrne / etc.'

The notes are brief and illuminating. Mr Grendon limits his detailed investigation to Old English—a wise limitation, making his volume the more compact—and thus safeguards himself from criticism for the omission of some interesting parallels. Even within these limits, however, some additions might be made; for example, to the parallels from *Beowulf* and Ælfric for 'shots sent by the devil' (note on A 1, l. 23) we may add *Andreas*, ll. 1330—2, *Crist*, ll. 759—771, *Juliana*, ll. 404 f. In this connexion it would be well to note that the idea has Christian as well as pagan associations, cf. *Ephesians* vi. 16. 'In omnibus sumentes scutum fidei, in quo possitis omnia tela nequissimi ignea exstinguere.' Similarly we must regard with caution Mr Grendon's statement that sanctification by contact was borrowed by the Church from pagan custom. The idea has an obvious psychological explanation—it is merely one form of contagious magic, and appears almost universally. One need only name such familiar examples as the Hindu charm remedies of pills of paper on which sacred texts have been written, and water in which such texts have been washed off; and the sanctification among the Tahitians of objects which have touched the images of idols. The idea is a natural growth in any religion, and in Christianity as much as in any other.

Mr Grendon writes very pleasantly, though insular prejudice must protest that 'grewsome' (p. 177) is a wanton disfigurement of 'gruesome,' and that even the liberal-minded authors of *The King's English* would hardly defend the vicious split infinitive on p. 157. In considering the volume as a whole, criticism is merged in acknowledgment; for if Mr Grendon does not utter a final word on any aspect of the subject, he offers very much that is suggestive, and presents this fascinating and rather neglected material in a most convenient and attractive form.

A. R. Skemp.

Sheffield.

Beowulf. Edited by W. J. Sedgefield. Manchester: University Press. 1910. 8vo. viii + 300 pp.

In England we have had no edition of *Beowulf* since the appearance of Wyatt's text and glossary (1894, 1898), though the elaborate work of Holthausen (1905-9) has appeared meanwhile in Germany. To this latter edition all later editors are necessarily under great obligations, and its influence is apparent in the work of Dr Sedgefield. The text, for example, is much less conservative than that of Wyatt, and on the lines of the modern reconstructed editions.

The Introduction is, perhaps, the most important part of the book, and sums up in a useful way the results of the investigation of the past few years. Following upon the account of the MS. and of the methods in accordance with which the text has been constructed, we have sections dealing concisely with the dialect, grammatical forms, syntax, metre, style and vocabulary. The evidence for the date of the poem is supplemented by the important criteria of Morsbach, which have been adopted as the basis of Richter's recent work, *Chronologische Studien zur angels. Literatur.* The remarks on metre are supplemented by a concise discussion in an appendix of the theories of Sievers and of Kaluza.

In his treatment of subject-matter, Dr Sedgefield follows the lines laid down by Olrik and Panzer, the mythological interpretations of the Müllenhof school being relegated to the background. The inclusion of this material distinguishes the present edition from all its predecessors, and suggests a new point of departure for later investigation. In this connexion, reference might have been made in the bibliography to the article by W. W. Lawrence, 'Some disputed questions in Beowulf Criticism[1].' The bibliography also omits Chadwick's *Origin of the English Nation,* which should have been included on other grounds. Dr Sedgefield's conclusion 'that the case for translation or adaptation of a Scandinavian poem is not proved, as the tone of the *Beowulf* is essentially English' seems more probable than that set forward by Panzer in his epoch-making book.

The text has been printed without any indications of vowel length,

[1] *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 1909.

but as this matter has been attended to in the glossary, no injustice has been done to students. In the glossary it would have been more correct to print 'þyhtig' and 'yppe' with long stressed vowels. Other false quantities are probably misprints.

The Notes contain much useful material, and among other things the case for certain emendations introduced by the editor: these have appeared separately in the *Modern Language Review*. With regard to the suggested reading 'wette' for 'wehte,' l. 2854, it may be worth noting that *Genesis*, l. 1922, has 'wætrum weaht.'

To discuss the whole of the material in the Notes is impossible here, but attention may be directed to a few points.

l. 24. 'leode' is more likely to be nom. plur. = 'people.' Cf. l. 2500 where 'gelæste' is followed by the accus. The glossary gives no hint of the accus. construction after 'gelæstan' = 'to help' (p. 236).

l. 204. 'sceawedon' would seem to mean 'examined,' 'gazed into.'

ll. 207—9. A note might have been added here, seeing that the references in 'secg' and 'land-gemyrcu' are by no means obvious.

l. 459. This note is misleading, since 'gesloh þin fæder' is the MS. reading. The deviation from the MS. in the text should have been indicated in a foot-note on p. 54.

l. 749. I imagine that 'wiđ earm gesæt' means 'rested on his arm' rather than 'clung to the arm,' cf. *Christ and Satan* (Grein-Wülker, II, 2, p. 545).

l. 870. Rieger's suggestion that these words might fall into a parenthesis was worth consideration.

l. 1072. Möller's identification of the 'Eotenas' with the followers of Hnæf and Hengest should have been noted. So also, in the list of proper names.

l. 1363. Miss Wright's discovery of the M.E. 'rind' = frost makes it possible to retain the MS. reading here.

l. 1512. 'aglæcan' is gen. rather than acc. sing.

ll. 1537 and 1541 demand some discussion. In the latter, 'andlean' is, on metrical grounds, the more likely reading.

The same remark applies to l. 1728, where, according to Klaeber, 'hweorfan' has merely the force of the verb 'to be.'

l. 1781. 'ofer' is treated differently in the note and in the glossary.

l. 1797. The argument seems insufficient to establish a collective force for 'þegnes.' Beowulf would naturally have a special attendant assigned to him.

l. 1936. 'handgrip' is more likely to mean 'arrest' than 'strangling.'

l. 2029. For 'ending with *leodhryre*' read 'ending with *duge*.'

l. 2035. It is difficult to see how 'dryhtbearn,' explained in the glossary as 'noble youth,' can stand in apposition to 'fæmnan.' Klaeber appears to refer 'dryhtbeorn' not to the son of Froda, but to the Danish attendant of Freawaru, and his interpretation suits the text admirably, cf. l. 2053.

In conclusion, we would thank Dr Sedgefield for an edition, the most elaborate that has yet appeared in English, which in its concise introduction and notes marshals much valuable material accessible up to now only in learned periodicals and dissertations.

P. G. Thomas.

London.

La vie de P. de Ronsard de Claude Binet (1586). By Paul Laumonier. Paris: Hachette. 1910. 8vo. xlviii + 259 pp.

Ronsard poète lyrique. By Paul Laumonier. Paris: Hachette. 1909. 8vo. li + 806 pp.

Tableau chronologique des œuvres de Ronsard, suivi de poésies non recueillies et d'une table alphabétique. By Paul Laumonier. 2me édition. Paris: Hachette. 1911. 8vo. xi + 140 pp.

The above three works, which are the fruit of ten years' continuous study, form at once a noble monument to the memory of Ronsard, and the most important contribution that has yet been made to the study of his poetry. It is with feelings of deep admiration that I offer to their author my most hearty congratulations. It will be convenient to notice first the edition of Binet's *Life*. Binet has long been regarded as an incontestable authority, and writer after writer has tranquilly repeated statements about Ronsard solely on the testimony of *le vieux* Binet. The first to question his credit was M. Henri Chamard, and it was some observations of his, made nearly twelve years ago, which convinced M. Laumonier that a critical examination of the *Life* was necessary. Before however he had realised his project, Miss Evers, an American student, published in 1905 a critical edition, based upon the three texts of 1586, 1587 and 1597[1]. M. Laumonier, while doing full justice to her work, rightly claims that it has not made his own superfluous. Certain inexactitudes, inevitable from the conditions under which Miss Evers was working, far from the *Bibliothèque nationale*, required correction, while the historical commentary, which in Miss Evers' edition was of very modest proportions, has become in M. Laumonier's expert hands of first-rate importance.

In the introduction M. Laumonier shows that Binet was only about seventeen when he was introduced to Ronsard, probably by Dorat, and probably in or about the year 1570; that he saw very little of him till the last three years of his life (1582—1585); and that it was not till after his death that he thought of writing his biography. M. Laumonier also discusses in detail the sources, actual and possible, of his information.

Binet's errors have been so constantly reproduced by Ronsard's biographers that it will be well to point out the most conspicuous ones. In 1540 Ronsard accompanied Lazare de Baïf, not to Speier, but to

[1] See *Modern Language Review*, I, p. 260.

Haguenau. Binet's statement that he went to Piedmont with Guillaume Du Bellay is not confirmed by any other writer, and is now generally abandoned. In his original text Binet, on the authority of Ronsard's biographical elegy (*Œuvres*, IV, 300), says that 'he lived with Dorat for *five* years,' but in the posthumous edition of Ronsard's *Works* (1587) *five* was altered to *seven* and Binet followed suit. M. Laumonier's explanation is that Ronsard spent only five years as an inmate of the Collège de Coqueret, and that the *seven* years includes the time during which he attended Dorat's lectures as an out-student. With regard to Binet's statement that Ronsard translated into French the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, M. Laumonier points out that according to the texts of 1586 and 1587 'he' may refer to Dorat, and that the fragment of the supposed translation (*Œuvres*, VII, 281), which was first printed in 1617, is of very doubtful authenticity. The story of the meeting between Ronsard and Du Bellay in an inn between Poitiers and Paris, which first appears in Binet's third edition, has already been examined at length by Miss Evers and shown to rest on no foundation. M. Laumonier thinks it probable that it was through Peletier that Du Bellay made Ronsard's acquaintance, and that the introduction took place at Paris in 1547.

I agree with M. Laumonier that Ronsard's death probably took place at two o'clock during the night of December 27—28, 1585, and that therefore the 28th is the correct date, but I should explain Binet's date of the 27th, not by any reference to the Roman method of counting time, but simply as a loose way of speaking. Finally on p. 84 there is an interesting note on the poet's outward appearance, including a reference to the most authentic portraits. We learn from his own poems that he grew old at an early age; that at thirty he was bald, grey, pale, and thin, and subject to rheumatism and insomnia.

The first question that presents itself to the indolent reviewer with regard to M. Laumonier's most important contribution to the subject, *Ronsard poète lyrique*, is whether eight hundred and fifty pages devoted to one side only of the poet's genius is not excessive. But the answer must be in the negative. In the first place, Ronsard is of enormous importance in the history of French poetry; secondly, the chronology of his poems, upon which so much depends, is very difficult to establish; and thirdly, he owes so much to literary models that an elaborate discussion of his sources was inevitable. M. Laumonier has arranged his book in three divisions, the first dealing with the genesis and evolution of his lyrical work, the second with his sources and originality, and the third, which is considerably shorter than the others, with his versification.

The chronology of Ronsard's poems according to their date of publication is fully determined in the third work at the head of this notice, which is a revised and greatly enlarged edition of what appeared seven or eight years ago in the *Annales Fléchoises*. A remark in the introduction thoroughly justifies this part of M. Laumonier's labours, and is so important that it must be quoted. 'La chronologie

des ouvrages de l'esprit rapprochée de la chronologie des autres actes de la vie est la base de toute étude littéraire sérieuse; si cette base manque, les efforts du critique n'ont d'autre résultat qu'une appréciation dogmatique ou impressioniste, toujours sujette à caution.' In his larger work the chronology of publication is supplemented, so far as regards the lyrical poems, by careful investigations, conducted with great learning, acuteness, and sobriety, into the dates of composition. Of special importance is the analysis (pp. 29—45) of Ronsard's first volume, *Les Quatre premiers livres des Odes. Ensemble son Bocage.* From this we learn that Ronsard began to write poetry in 1540 or 1541 as a disciple, though an independent one, of Marot. To the influence of Marot was joined that of Horace, and though nothing of Ronsard's appeared in print before 1547, and only four poems in all before 1550, he had written a good many poems before he entered, under the influence of Dorat and Greek literature, on what may be called his Pindaric phase. This lasted from 1545 to 1552, and M. Laumonier points out with just criticism all that there was of extravagance and failure in it. But in the Fifth book of Odes, published in 1552 with the *Amours*, Ronsard, anxious to obtain the ear of the Court, and urged by his well-wishers, began to sacrifice some of his lofty classical principles, and to return to the national tradition represented by Marot. Finally in the *Continuation des Amours* (1555), and in the *Nouvelle Continuation* (1556)[1], generally known as the *Amours de Marie*, he definitely abandoned alike Pindarism and Petrarchism. To the later volume he prefixed by way of dedication the well-known elegy to Jean de Morel (VI, 229) which, as M. Laumonier points out, is a true literary manifesto. Even more pronounced as 'a profession of amorous and literary faith' is the *Élégie à son livre* (I, 141), which concludes the volume by way of epilogue, and which afterwards served as a preface to the *Second livre des Amours* in the 1560 edition of his collected works.

All this shows how fallacious is the view that Ronsard 'redeemed French poetry from the prison which had Marot for governor.' The Pléiade built on the foundations which Marot had laid. Its poetry was not a revolution, but an evolution—an evolution which gave to French poetry the inestimable gift of style. Ronsard acquired the secret of this largely through the study of literary models. And this forms the subject of M. Laumonier's second part. To the study of Ronsard's sources he brings a really remarkable knowledge of Greek, Latin, neo-Latin, and Italian poetry, and it is impossible to praise too highly this part of his work. He rightly points out that while Ronsard's Pindaric odes are a failure, Pindar's influence had a favourable effect on his other works, such as his Hymns, his *Poèmes*, and his *Discours*. His debt to Horace has never been treated before with such fullness of detail, and in M. Laumonier's judgment, if Ronsard falls short of his model in

[1] The only known copy of this volume, which is in the Arsenal library, wants 18 leaves, but minute and careful research, with the aid of two very rare re-impressions, printed at Rouen and Basle respectively, has enabled M. Laumonier to re-construct the contents of the missing leaves.

concision and brilliancy of finish, he has learnt much from him in the way of choice of subject, plan, and artistic expression.

But it is in the various forms of the lighter lyric—the lyric of nature, the lyric of love, and the drinking song—that M. Laumonier rightly sees the perfection of Ronsard's genius. Here again there is much that is new in his investigation of sources, especially as regards the neo-Latin poets Secundus, Marullus, Pontano, and Navagero. At the same time he makes it abundantly clear that Ronsard's bookish inspiration is in this part of his work corrected by his sincerity. If he writes with models before him, he none the less expresses his own personal emotions, and he adapts his models with exquisite skill to the circumstances of his own life and surroundings. M. Laumonier lays special emphasis on Ronsard's fidelity to nature, and his testimony is all the more valuable as he himself is a native of the Loir valley. It is only in the Petrarchan poems that Ronsard is insincere, for the simple reason that his sentiment was at the opposite pole to Petrarch's. The great Italian's love was spiritual and constant. Ronsard's was avowedly, even cynically, sensuous and fickle.

In his third part M. Laumonier devotes himself to a study of Ronsard's metres and rhythms. Here again he rightly insists on the importance of Marot, especially of his translation of the Psalms. More, perhaps, might have been said of Margaret of Navarre, who introduced a considerable number of new lyric metres. As regards the influence of classical metres in Ronsard, M. Laumonier is particularly suggestive, pointing out how he was affected in certain cases by the physiognomy of the printed text.

It is one of the many admirable features of M. Laumonier's book that he never loses his critical balance. One may not always agree with his judgment on particular poems—an Englishman's standpoint must always be a little different to a Frenchman's—but there is no question as to the fairness and sanity of his general estimate. Particularly interesting is his defence of Ronsard, as against Estienne Pasquier, as a critic of his own works. But this defence is almost wholly directed to Ronsard's exclusion of certain poems from the successive editions of his collected works. With regard to his revision of the poems which he included, M. Laumonier says little, except to point out the general principles which influenced him. To form an adequate judgment as to his success we must await M. Laumonier's critical edition of his works, which is announced for publication by the *Société des textes français modernes*.

M. Laumonier concludes with a quotation from M. Faguet that Ronsard is 'one of the three or four great names of French literature.' This is a hard saying as it stands. Ten names, at least, occur to one which are greater than Ronsard's. But this much is true, that no writer, except Pascal and Chateaubriand, has had so far-reaching an influence on the form of French literature.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Grammar of the Gothic Language. By JOSEPH WRIGHT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1910. 8vo. ix + 366 pp.

Dr Wright's *Gothic Primer* is now superseded by his much larger *Grammar of the Gothic Language.* The new book will certainly prove welcome to the English student. Besides an almost complete Phonology and Accidence of Gothic it contains, like the author's other grammars, a concise and, within its very narrow limits, excellent sketch of Indo-Germanic and Primitive Germanic phonology, while, in the Accidence, the Gothic forms are also generally referred to their Primitive Germanic type. One could only wish that the author had been less dogmatic in this part of the book. As a rule, he only states conclusions which all seem equally assured; but the material on which they are based and the problematic nature of not a few are scarcely hinted at. The Syntax is practically a reprint of the sketch in the *Primer* and, as such, unsatisfactory and antiquated. But Dr Wright surely knows this himself.

In the preface, Dr Wright claims that anybody who 'thoroughly masters the book, will not only have gained a comprehensive knowledge of Gothic, but will also have acquired a considerable knowledge of Comparative Germanic Grammar.' Excepting the syntax, I gladly endorse this claim, as also the valuable advice given to the student at the end of the preface.

The following corrections ought to be made:

P. 196. (2) Editions. Dr Wright says, the specimens have been taken from Heyne's edition. Of course, they are based on Streitberg's text.

P. 266. L. ii, 29. Read '[fraujímond] frauja.' See Streitberg, *Got. Bibel*, I, 482, and II, XV to the passage.

P. 292. Note to M. vi, 15. 'ni þáu' renders Gr. *οὐδέ* and introduces the apodosis of the conditional sentence. Why suggest that the Gothic means something different from the Greek?

P. 299. Note to L. ii, 20. 'gahausjan' does not govern the genitive. 'þizeei' is simply attracted into the case of the preceding 'in allaize.'

P. 301. Note to *Tim.* II, i, 26. 'usskarjaindan' should be read and a corresponding alteration made in the text, p. 289. 'us-skawjan,' p. 357, should be replaced by 'us-skarjan.'

Would it not have been better to have given the Greek text throughout? The vocabulary, as far as I have tested it, seems very complete and reliable.

J. STEPPAT.

LONDON.

Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. Von FRIEDRICH KLUGE. Siebente Auflage. Strassburg: Trübner. 1910. 8vo. xvi + 519 pp.

For thirty years Prof. Kluge's dictionary in its numerous editions has formed a standard work of reference for every student of Teutonic philology. As the author explains in the preface, the book has gradually changed its character. Originally designed to illustrate the relationship between the German language and its cognates, its principal aim has become to throw light upon the historical development of the literary idiom. The new edition appears considerably enlarged. The letter M, to take an example at random, which contained 262 main words in the previous issue, now shows 43 additional entries. An examination of the new words will show that Prof. Kluge has made good use of his more recent researches into the 'Standes- und Gewerbesprachen'; five (*Maat, Mars, Mastkorb, Messe*[2], *Mole*) belong to the 'Seemannssprache' which is becoming more widely known all over the country. Among new dialect words under M we notice in particular *Marterl* and *Machandel*; *Misels* (pl.) is another addition recalling Goethe's 'First Wild Weeks at Weimar'; the right etymology is given (from Alsatian *müsele*, 'little mouse'). Baumgartner who makes fun of the expression in his biography of Goethe, and even very recent writers, derive it from *Demoiselle*, which is obviously wrong. Prof. Kluge records the plural form only; but the singular, *Mi(e)sel*, was quite usual, as was the infinitive *miseln*: Corona Schröter, for instance, is referred to as 'das schöne Misel.'

Besides adding new articles the author has considerably altered and enlarged the original ones. Fuller references to the ever-growing etymological literature are given, and the invaluable material collected in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* has been extensively drawn upon. We regret to notice, however, that all these undoubted improvements have led to the omission of the introduction, the chronological tables and, above all, the index to the non-German words mentioned in the dictionary. Thus the author succeeds in preserving the former size of the book; but we are convinced that the majority of the prospective users would gladly have paid a small additional sum in order to retain the last-mentioned list which forms so useful a feature in Walde's *Latin Dictionary*. On the other hand, it is gratifying to notice that the field of the 'Sachregister' at the end has been very much widened. Thus we have new references to 'Aberglaube,' 'Baukunst,' 'Nautisches,' 'Rechtsgeschichte,' 'Shakespeare,' etc. A brief inspection of these entries will show how much human interest there is after all to be found in the study of etymology.

On the whole, Dr Kluge is very conservative in his method. The many new-fangled ideas which have lately sprung up among etymologists do not find favour with him; as far as we can see there is not a single word explained as a 'Streckform'—and on this point the author may be right.

It would be difficult to single out articles of special interest for comment. The critical insight, the thorough methods, the concise and yet clear style of the author are too well known to require particular mention. We add a few remarks on some special points. *Gurgel*: the Latin word ousted the native and cognate equivalent probably because it was more onomatopoetic. Owing to the two shifts of consonants and the vowel changes the O.H.G. *querchala* had lost that quality.—*Herd* in the sense of 'Boden' is said to be exclusively H.G.; cp., however, *Beowulf*, 403 (ed. Holthausen[1]):

[hige-rōf ēode,]
heard under helme, þæt hē on heo[r]ðe gestōd.

—*Pfennig*: the ending *ing* seems to have a diminutive sense (cf. *Besing*, Kluge). Considering the shape of many early coins, hollow bracteates, I have no doubt that the meaning is 'Pfännchen,' 'little pan.' In the same way *Schilling* may be connected with the root contained in *Schale*[1], O.E. *sciell*, Goth. *skalja*, as meaning 'a small, thin metal plate,' 'ein Plättchen,' 'Schüppchen' (cf. North G. slang *Plaaten* [plātn], 'money, cash,' for H.G. *Platte*(*n*)). The derivation from *Schild* (Weigand[5]; Falk-Torp) is improbable, and as to Prof. Kluge's suggestion, it seems very doubtful whether the idea of 'klingende Münze' was likely to occur to the primitive Teuton.—*Turm*: the change of *n* into *m* is due to assimilation. The lip-rounding of the vowel was imparted to the *r* and then affected the *n*. Similar cases described as 'corruptions' are frequent in the English dialects. E.g. *holm* < *holn*, 'holly,' *N.E.D.*; *lum* < **lun* < Scand. *lundr*, 'a wood,' *Dial. Dict.* Another case in point is Germ. dial. *Dumm*, 'Dung' [*duŋ* > *dum*]. In the Germ. dial. form *Harm* from *Harn* quoted by Prof. Kluge, s.v. *Turm*, the change was most probably brought about by the same cause, the *a* being pronounced with lip-rounding [ɒ] in many German dialects.

Heinrich Mutschmann.

Nottingham.

Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. Von Daniel Sanders. Neu bearbeitet, ergänzt und vermehrt von J. Ernst Wülfing. Achte Aufl. (erste der Neubearbeitung). Leipzig: Wigand. 1910. 8vo. xii + 887 pp.

Sanders' *Handwörterbuch*, after running through seven editions, appears in an altered and very much improved form for which the new editor, Dr Wülfing, of Bonn, has our best congratulations. The dictionary, originally an abridgment of the large 'Sanders,' aims at being a reasonably complete record of modern literary German for the use of those who for some reason or other are either unable or unwilling to consult the parent work. To reduce to alphabetical order the multifarious phenomena of a language with a long and agitated history, still enjoying a vigorous life and giving fair promise of a still more

prosperous future, is a task that has attracted many an enthusiast. But unless the work be undertaken on the scale of the *N.E.D.*, or the *Grimmsche Wörterbuch*, it can never be perfectly accomplished. However, the successive editors of the *Handwörterbuch* have succeeded in their task as far as the limitations imposed by the available space would allow them. The clear and ample explanations of the various words and phrases are, when necessary, accompanied by quotations from Luther's version of the Scriptures, from the classical writers and others, which gives more life to the book. The meanings, frequently very numerous, of the individual words are for the most part arranged as in the *N.E.D.*: the original sense is given first and the others follow in the order as they were evolved. Some of the articles are really admirable for clearness and completeness (cp., e.g., those on 'Welt,' 'Not'). Obsolete words are given when found in literature, and special attention has been devoted to all those cases where the usage and meaning of words in the classical writers deviate from present day German. Pure dialect words like 'finzlich,' 'görzen' found in Goethe's private letters are not included; nor could we expect to find such transparent nonce-formations as 'überhirnig' (Lenau, Briefe) or 'Säuselbrut' (id. *Faust*). But apart from these justifiable omissions it is surprising to find how much information is contained on these 887 pages. There is a very legitimate tendency in modern language teaching to make use only of dictionaries written throughout in one language: we have no hesitation in recommending the new 'Kleine Sanders' to the advanced student. But for one defect to be mentioned presently it has everything in its favour.

There are no etymologies, which is a commendable feature; for the work is not intended to take the place of any of the existing purely scientific works such as those of Kluge, Weigand, Heyne or Paul. 'Fremdwörter' are not included, unless they have become 'Lehnwörter'; here the editor had to exercise his own discretion, and the line had to be drawn somewhere. But if 'Chor' and 'Parade' were inserted, why not 'Kommisz' with its numerous compounds, a most popular word which has been in the language ever since Grimmelshausen and the Thirty Years' War? The accent of the main words is marked, and also the length of the vowels in the stressed syllables. This is a good plan, for an accurate phonetic transcription of each word is neither necessary nor desirable in the present hopeless state of confusion among phoneticians. There is one point, however, against which we must enter a strong protest. Dr Wülfing adopts Prof. Trautmann's views on the pronunciation of the German *e*-sounds. He distinguishes two varieties, both long and short, and gives historical reasons for it. The simple facts, however, concerning Northern (i.e. standard) German are, that short *e* and *ä* are pronounced exactly alike (mid-front-wide); the long *e* is narrow, the long *ä* is wide. This development is largely due to the spelling which in itself is arbitrary with regard to *e* and *ä*; for the Low German speakers in adopting the High German idiom have nothing to guide them except the spelling.

No one acquainted with the history of any literary κοινή will deny that it must be largely influenced by the written form, even if he does not go so far as Prof. Braune does in advocating a deliberate spelling-pronunciation. The business of the phonetician is to record the facts, and nothing but the facts; and if he is a philologist at all, he will understand and respect them: 'non ridere, non lugere, neque detestari, sed intelligere' should be his motto. Dr Wülfing is to be congratulated on not having introduced Prof. Trautmann's fantastic spelling in place of the reformed official one, for the result would have been disastrous. The sooner he abandons the attitude of a phonetic dictator the better it will be for the success of an otherwise admirable work.

Heinrich Mutschmann.

Nottingham.

MINOR NOTICES.

The reprint of Robert Browning's *Men and Women*, as originally published in 1855 (Oxford Library of Prose and Poetry, London, Frowde, 1910), forms an attractive volume. In the later editions, as is well known, the poems were arranged differently by the author, and are to be found now, with others, under various heads, 'Dramatic Lyrics,' 'Dramatic Romances,' 'Men and Women,' and 'In a Balcony.' The original *Men and Women* included, for example, *Love among the Ruins*, *Evelyn Hope*, *By the Fireside*, *The Statue and the Bust*, *The Last Ride Together*, *Old Pictures in Florence*, *Saul*, *Two in the Campagna*, and *A Grammarian's Funeral*, and did not include several of the pieces which now stand under the title, as *Pictor Ignotus* and *The Bishop orders his Tomb*. Poems of such diverse nature as were originally contained in the two volumes of 1855, might well seem to demand redistribution, and those which remained under the original title were such as could more properly be called character studies. The original collection, however, is a singularly interesting representative miscellany, and it is well once more to have the 'fifty men and women' standing, as they originally stood, before the lines which express their dedication. The texts of the poems remained practically unaltered in the later editions.

In Dr Gabrielson's *Rime as a Criterion of the Pronunciation of Spenser, Pope, Byron and Swinburne* (Uppsala, 1909) we have a contribution to the history of the Modern English stressed vowels. Some work has already been done on the pronunciation of Spenser as determined by his rimes, but for the most part Dr Gabrielson is working on new ground. He collects an enormous mass of material and deals with it critically, but the book suffers from the fact that no attempt is made to present the results of the enquiry in any concise form. The book can only be of value to the student who is prepared to work

closely and in detail through some two hundred pages of printed matter and endeavour to do for himself what might so much more easily have been done by the author. The chief impressions one gleans from the book (apart from the author's primary intention) are the hopeless condition of our present texts of Spenser for exact philological study, and the importance of traditional influence in determining rime-usage. Mention may also be made of some interesting paragraphs on traces of dialectal influence in the rimes of Byron, due to his early years in Aberdeenshire.

A. M.

Dr A. T. Bødtker's *Critical Contributions to Early English Syntax*, Second Series (*Videnskabs Selskabets Skrifter*, Christiania, 1910), is a series of notes on the syntax of the Personal, Demonstrative and Relative pronouns and on the temporal use of 'what.' The main feature of these contributions is that they tend to throw back to an earlier period certain constructions which are now considered to be Middle English developments and at the same time disprove French and Scandinavian influences which have been alleged as the cause of their development. With the majority of Dr Bødtker's conclusions one must agree, but in the discussion of some of the constructions it would seem that undue importance is given to extracts from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle MSS. E and F, as evidence for their early occurrence. It must be remembered that E is a 12th century MS., which may well show foreign influence in its syntax, as it does in its language, while F belongs to the end of the 11th or the beginning of the 12th century, though it is at the same time a good deal more conservative in its tendencies than E.

A. M.

Dr H. T. Price's *History of Ablaut in the Strong Verbs from Caxton to the end of the Elizabethan Period* (Bonner Studien zur Englischen Philologie, Heft III.) is a sound and scholarly piece of work, worthy of a pupil of Professor Bülbring. The author has covered a wide field of reading in his investigations and has not confined himself to the usages of the standard writers or even of printed books as a whole. In order to determine how far colloquial may differ from written usage he has made a study of letters, diaries, etc. which have only been printed within the last few years. The result is the accumulation of a vast mass of material which can only be in part presented within the limits of a dissertation. Fortunately for us Dr Price is not content, as too many thesis-writers are, with the accumulation of material: he has arranged his matter clearly and draws his inferences carefully. Of these the chief are (1) that the final consonant in the preterite singular, e.g. *was, chose, gave* as contrasted with O.E. *wæs, ceas, geaf*, probably remained unvoiced until 1500, (2) that even in Caxton the stem of the preterite plural has become identical with that of the singular, (3) that the participial forms in *-en* gradually passed out of use in the sixteenth century and that the distinction between participial

and adjectival forms dates from the same period. He shows further that the usage in Caxton tends to be conservative and that the plenitude of his disagreement with what was soon to be the usage of standard literary English tends to disprove any idea that Caxton created standard English. Further, Dr Price does not confine himself to the broad lines of his enquiry, he has many interesting paragraphs on incidental forms, and some of his discussions, e.g., of the forms *choose, lose* and *shoot*, are of the highest interest and value.

A. M.

The clearly defined limitations, and the completeness within these limits, make the *Concise Dictionary of Icelandic*, by Geir T. Zoega (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), a minor follower of Cleasby and Vigfusson's *Icelandic Dictionary* welcome; the price, too, which is only one-seventh of that of the large work, brings the book within the reach of every student. The author is the greatest native lexicographer now living, and his thorough knowledge of English, displayed in his earlier works, an *English-Icelandic* and an *Icelandic-English Dictionary* (Reykjavik, 1896 and 1904), has stood him in good stead in that cleansing and remodelling which had to be undertaken, if the material of the large Oxford Dictionary was to be brought up to date. But we are probably not wrong in ascribing a very considerable share of the work to the supervisor and editor, Dr W. A. Craigie. With regard to the principles followed in the new dictionary, there are some points in which the philologist, especially in Scandinavia, might have wished for more radical reforms: for example, the retention of separate places for the short vowels and their long equivalents, with the exception of *e*, a matter which ought to have been mentioned in the preface; the absence of distinction between the two verbs *þýða*; the inconsistency of spelling in *eyfit, mjófast, sujófa*, compared with *ævi, gørvi, stöðva*, and the suppression, except in the list of irregular forms, of the sound *ǫ́*, and other important varieties.

H. B. G.

There is no want of interest in the two contrasting volumes which open the new series of *Clásicos Castellanos* (Paris: Honoré Champion), issued, in the first instance, by the managers of *La Lectura* at Madrid. Something of the kind is needed by students of Spanish literature, for the volumes forming the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* are expensive, clumsy to handle, ill-printed, and, in too many cases, the texts are corrupt. The volumes published by *La Lectura* are cheap and convenient, the type is clear, and pains have been taken to provide a trustworthy text. In editing *Las Moradas* of St Theresa, Sr. D. Tomás Navarro Tomás has rightly followed the *edición autografiada* of the saint's manuscript published by the Carmelite nuns at Seville in 1882. Sr. D. Américo Castro has had a harder task in producing the first volume of Tirso de Molina's *Obras* (represented here by *El Vergonzoso en Palacio* and *El Burlador de Sevilla y Convidado de Piedra*). He throws light on some obscure passages in the latter play by utilizing

the re-cast of *El Burlador*, entitled *Tan largo me lo fiáis*, and corrects some obvious slips which escaped notice in Sr. Cotarelo's edition of Tirso de Molina's *comedias* (*Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*). The plan of the new series does not allow of copious annotation, and the spelling has been modernized: this produces—especially in the case of *Las Moradas* where such forms as *pusilaminidad* and *corbadia* are preserved (p. 22)—a confused and unpleasing effect. It would have been preferable to follow the excellent example set in M. Foulché-Delbosc's *Bibliotheca Hispanica*.

On p. ix of the *prólogo* to Tirso de Molina's *Obras*, it is stated that Tirso took part in the poetical joust in honour of St Isidore at Madrid in 1625. The date should be 1622: Lope de Vega's *Relacion de las Fiestas que la insigne villa de Madrid hizo en la canonizacion de su bienaventurado Hijo y Patron San Isidro* was published before the close of that year. But it would be ungracious to dwell on the trifling defects of a series that seems likely to be of great service to the average student.

J. F.-K.

It is doubtful whether any further English versions of *Don Quixote* are needed. While Shelton's is probably the most fascinating and least accurate, Ormsby's is certainly the most scholarly; and between these two every conceivable variety is represented. Mr Robinson Smith has lately attempted the task afresh (*That Imaginative Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha*, London: Routledge, 1910). Of his predecessors he says in the Preface that 'for occasional words and phrases' he is indebted to Shelton, Ormsby and Watts. It would be an easy task to demonstrate that the word 'occasional' is altogether inadequate in this connexion. However, Mr Smith's chief claim to originality is put forward in the following words: 'The short stories in the *Don Quixote*, which prove a stumbling-block to many readers and which Cervantes himself practically acknowledges interfere with the unity and flow of the main narrative, have been omitted, together with some of the poor poetry, but the translation is not therefore to be considered abridged or expurgated. Rather it may be contended that here the reader will find the true consecutive narrative for the first time.' It should be added that intending readers are not warned of this piece of vandalism on the title-page, and that minor omissions abound throughout. Every true Cervantist, the general reader no less than the mere scholar, will regard this proceeding as an impertinence. Mr Smith's version, moreover, has no merits as a translation to commend it. Cervantes never lost his dignity of manner, even in his wildest moments; this translation is not only inaccurate but flippant, as the following examples, taken at random from the first few pages, will serve to show: *duelos y quebrantos*, 'paunch and pleasance' (p. 1); *dos golpes*, 'two cuffs' (of a sword) (p. 3); *Don Quijote vinó á correrse*, 'Don Quixote flew off the handle' (p. 8); *á las ancas del caballo*, 'back of (!) the saddle' (p. 13); 'the poor chap,' an addition of doubtful value on p. 14; *atended, que no por culpa mia, sino de mi caballo estoy aquí tendido*, 'stand! not I but my horse is why

I am stretched out here' (p. 21); *estos malditos libros de caballerías que él tiene y suele leer tan de ordinario*, 'those cursed books of chivalry, which he reads with never a let-up' (p. 24). No book is wholly bad, and it is a pleasure to be able to add that a few of Mr Smith's introductory remarks dealing with Cervantes' possible sources are worthy of consideration.

H. O.

Dr M. E. Cosenza, who is Instructor in Latin in the University of the City of New York, has given us a first instalment of his studies in Petrarch's humanism in his *Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors, translated from the Latin with a Commentary* (The University of Chicago Press, 1910). After the labours of Fracassetti, Pierre de Nolhac and others, there is scarcely room for much originality and research in matters relating to Petrarch's letters and humanism, as the present editor is the first to admit. However, so far as we are aware, this set of letters had not previously been presented to English readers in a complete form. Moreover, and this constitutes the real importance and *raison d'être* of the book, these classical letters had never, even in Italy, been annotated with such thoroughness. Some may even think that the commentary is too full. But in view of Petrarch's immense importance in the revival of classical learning, we are grateful to Dr Cosenza for this portion of his book.

H. O.

We have been asked to draw attention to the formation in Hamburg of a North Frisian Language Fund. The appeal is for 5000 marks, 'um die Drucklegung des neu erblühten friesischen Schrifttums für die nächsten Jahre zu sichern. Es handelt sich in erster Linie um Schullesebücher und Volksliederbücher, die unentgeltlich hauptsächlich an die Schuljugend vom 12.—14. Jahre verteilt werden sollen, solange der friesische Schul-Unterricht noch fakultativ ist. Die Schulbücher enthalten u. a. den reichen friesischen Sagenschatz; ferner Erzählungen, Poesien usw., alles in heimatliches Gewand gekleidet, genährt und getränkt aus dem Strome uralter, aber noch immer lebendiger Erinnerung.' As the Frisians are the nearest relatives of the Anglo-Saxon race, and their language still bears the clearest traces of this ancient kinship, it would be highly fitting if some encouragement and assistance towards the maintenance of that language could be given from this side of the North Sea. Even if the practical object should not be completely realized, a valuable record of the present form of these dialects will at least be obtained, and afford interesting material for philological study. It has been suggested that any subscriptions sent from this country might be specially devoted to the production of a reading-book in the dialect of Amrum and Föhr, for use in the schools of those islands; this is at present being prepared by Dr Julius Tedsen. Dr W. A. Craigie (15, Charlbury Road, Oxford) will be glad to take charge of English contributions and forward them in due course for the benefit of the fund.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

December, 1910—February, 1911.

GENERAL.

Festschrift Wilhelm Vietor. Die Neueren Sprachen 1910, Ergänzungsband. Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 7 M.

Meyer, E. A., Untersuchungen über Lautbildung. Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 2 M.

Roudet, L., Éléments de phonétique générale. Paris, H. Welter. 10 fr.

Santayana, G., Three Philosophical poets: Lucretius, Dante and Goethe. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, I.) Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University. (London, H. Frowde.) 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

General.

Bibliotheca romanica. 117, 118. B. de Saint-Pierre, Paul et Virginie. 119. Molière, Le Tartuffe. 120—122. Boccaccio, La Fiammetta. 123. Machiavelli, Mandragola. 124. C. Goldoni, Le donne curiose. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each no. 40 pf.

Jahresbericht, Kritischer, über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie. Herausg. von K. Vollmöller. X. 1. Heft. Erlangen, F. Junge. 7 M. 20.

Italian.

Bandello, M., Le quattro parti de le Novelle riprodotte nelle antiche stampe di Lucca (1554) e di Lione (1573) a cura di G. B. Crivelli. Vol. II. Turin, Unione Tip. Editr. Torinese. 7 L.

Bandello, M., Le novelle, a cura di G. Brognoligo, III. (Scrittori d' Italia, IX.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Buronzo, V., Introduzione allo studio del 'Dolce stil novo dantesco.' Turin, C. Pasta. 3 L. 50.

Cocai, M., Le Maccheronee, a cura di A. Luzio, I. (Scrittori d' Italia, X.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Dall' Ongaro, F., Rime e prose varie, con introduzione a cura di N. Meneghetti. (Poeti storici filosofi del Risorgimento, II.) Como, R. Gagliardi. 1 L.

Dante Alighieri, La vita nova, per cura di M. Scherillo. Milan, Hoepli. 2 L.

Debenedetti, S., Gli studi provenzali in Italia nel cinquecento. Turin, E. Loescher. 10 L.

Gozzi, C. Memorie inutili. Vol. II, a cura di G. Prezzolini. (Scrittori d' Italia, VIII.) Bari, G. Laterza. 5 L. 50.

Graf, A., L' anglomania e l' influsso inglese in Italia nel sec. XVIII. Turin, E. Loescher. 12 L.

Hazard, P., La Révolution française et les lettres italiennes. Essai sur l'influence française en Italie de 1789 à 1815. Paris, Hachette. 10 fr.

Jeanroy, A., G. Carducci, l'homme et le poète. Paris, Champion. 5 fr.

Ladenarda, F. E., G. Carducci. Vol. II. Palermo, G. Pedone-Lauriel. 3 L. 50.

Maynial, E., Casanova et son temps. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 f. 50.

Nievo, I., Gli amori garibaldini, con poesie inedite e introduzione a cura di D. Bulferetti. (Poeti storici filosofi del Risorgimento, I.) Como, R. Gagliardi. 1 L.

Trabaudi, F. F., Della critica letteraria di G. Carducci : note ed osservazioni. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. 3 L. 50.

French.

(*a*) *General.*

Brunot, F., Histoire de la langue française, des origines à 1900. Tome III. La formation de la langue classique (1600–1660). 2me partie. Paris, A. Colin. 7 fr. 50.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Bartsch, K., Chrestomathie de l'ancien français. 10me éd., revue et corrigée par L. Wiese. Leipzig, Vogel. 14 M.

Chançun, La, de Guillelme. Französisches Volksepos des XI. Jahrhunderts. Kritisch herausg. von H. Suchier. (Bibliotheca Normannica, VIII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Langlois, E., Les manuscrits du roman de la rose, description et classement. Paris, H. Champion. 12 fr.

Vergi, La chastelaine, poème du XIII^e^ siècle. Édité par .Raynaud. (Les classiques français du moyen-âge.) Paris, H. Champion. 80 c.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Chardonchamp, G., La famille de Voltaire. Les Arouet, tableau généalogique et blasons. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr. 50.

Chateaubriand, Correspondance, publ. avec introduction et notes par L. Thomas. Tome I. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Chénier, A., Œuvres complètes, publ. par P. Dimoff. Tome II. Poèmes, hymnes, théâtre. Paris, Delagrave. 3 fr. 50.

Flaubert, G., Œuvres complètes. Œuvres de jeunesse inédites. Tome II. 1839–42. Paris, L. Conard. 8 fr.

Gazier, A., Les derniers jours de Blaise Pascal, étude historique et critique. Paris, H. Champion. 1 fr. 50.

Guy, H., Histoire de la poésie française au XVI^e^ siècle. Tome I. L'école des rhétoriqueurs. (Bibl. litt. de la Renaissance, Tome IV.) Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Hervier, M., Les écrivains français jugés par leurs contemporains. Tome I. Le XVI^e^ et le XVII^e^ siècle. Paris, Delaplane.

Hugo, V., Œuvres complètes, édit. de l'Imprimerie nationale. Tome XIX. Paris, Ollendorff. 20 fr.

Ippolito, F. G., Taine e la filosofia dell' arte. Rome, E. Loescher. 1 L. 50.

Labarthe, G., Le théâtre pendant les jours du Siège et de la Commune (1870–71). Paris, Fischbacher. 2 fr. 50.

Lachèvre, F., Le libertinage au XVII^e^ siècle. Disciples et successeurs de Théophile de Viau. La vie et les poésies libertines inédites de Des Barreaux (1599–1673) et de Saint-Pavin (1595–1670). Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Lanson, G., Manuel bibliographique de la littérature française moderne 1500–1900, fasc. 3, XVIII^e^ siècle. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Laumonier, P., Tableau chronologique des œuvres de Ronsard, suivies de poésies non recueillies et d'une table alphabétique. 2^e^ édit. Paris, Hachette. 5 fr.

Masson, P. M., Lamartine. Paris, Hachette. 2 fr.

Michaut, G., Sainte-Beuve amoureux et poète, étude sur le 'Livre d'Amour.' Paris, A. Durel. 3 fr. 50.

Millien, A., Chants et chansons populaires du Nivernais. Tome III. Paris, E. Leroux. 10 fr.

Molinier, H. J., Essai biographique et littéraire sur Octavien de Saint-Gelays, évêque d'Angoulême (1468–1502). Paris, A. Picard. 4 fr.

Molinier, H. J., Mellin de Saint-Gelays (1490–1558). Étude sur sa vie et sur ses œuvres. Paris, A. Picard. 7 fr. 50.

Musset, A., Œuvres complémentaires réunies et annotées par Maurice Allem. Paris, Mercure de France. 3 fr. 50.

Nadar, Charles Baudelaire intime. Paris, A. Blaizot. 15 fr.

Reboul, J., Un grand précurseur des romantiques. Ramond (1755–1827). Paris, Hachette. 4 fr.

Retinger, J. H., Histoire de la littérature française du Romantisme à nos jours. Paris, B. Grasset. 3 fr. 50.

Rossel, V., et H. E. Jenny, Histoire de la littérature suisse. Tome II. Paris, Fischbacher. 3 fr. 50.

Rousseau, J. J., Lettres inédites à Madame Boy de La Tour et Delessert. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 20 fr.

Runtz-Rees, C., Charles de Sainte-Marthe (1512–55). (Columbia University Studies in Romance Philology and Literature.) New York, Columbia Univ. Press.

Sainte-Beuve, C. A., Livre d'amour. Préface par J. Troubert. Paris, A. Durel. 25 fr.

Vallette, G., J. J. Rousseau génevois. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 7 fr. 50.

Voltaire, Lettres philosophiques, introduction et commentaires par H. Labroue. Paris, Delagrave. 3 fr. 50.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

Collin, J., Henrik Ibsen. Sein Werk, seine Weltanschauung, sein Leben. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 9 M.

Þiðriks Saga af Bern. Udgivet for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved H. Bertelsen. 5. Haefte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 kr. 50.

Dutch.

Faustspiel, Das niederländische, des 17. Jahrhunderts. Herausg. von E. F. Kossmann. Hague, M. Nijhoff. 2 fl. 40.

Honderd beste Gedichten in de Nederlandsche Taal. Glasgow, Gowans and Gray. 6*d.* net.

Kalff, G., Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde. vi. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 6 fl. 50.

Rijn, G. van, Nicolaas Beets. i. Rotterdam, J. M. Bredée. 4 fl.

English.

(*a*) *General.*

Gadde, F., On the History and Use of the Suffixes -ery (-ry), -age and -ment in English. Lund, Gleerup (London, W. Heffer). 2 kr.

Saintsbury, G., Historical Manual of English Prosody. London, Macmillan. 5*s.* net.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Beowulf. Mit ausführlichem Glossar herausg. von M. Heyne. 9 Aufl. bearbeitet von L. L. Schücking. (Angelsächsische Denkmäler, i.) Paderborn, Schöningh. 5 M. 80.

Beowulf and the Finnsburg Fragment. A translation into modern English prose by J. R. Clark Hall. London, Sonnenschein. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Borgström, E., The Proverbs of Alfred. Reedited from the MSS. with an introduction, notes and glossary. Lund, Gleerup. 3 kr.

Cynewulf, Elene. Mit Einleitung, Glossar, Anmerkungen und der lateinischen Quelle herausg. von F. Holthausen. 2 Aufl. (Alt- und mittelenglische Texte, iv.) Heidelberg, Winter. 2 M.

Havelok. Mit Einleitung, Glossar und Anmerkungen herausg. von F. Holthausen. 2 Aufl. (Alt- und mittelenglische Texte, i.) Heidelberg, Winter. 2 M. 40.

Kenyon, J. S., The Syntax of the Infinitive in Chaucer. (Chaucer Society, ii, 44.) London.

Marik, J., W-Schwund im Mittel- und Frühenglischen. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, xxxiii.) Vienna, Braumüller. 3 M. 40.

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Bond, R. Warwick, Early Plays from the Italian. Edited with Essay, Introduction and Notes. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Brontë, E., Works. Vol. i. Edited by C. Shorter. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 6*s.* net.

Clough, A. H., Poems. Edited by H. S. Milford. London, Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Cook, A. S., The Authorized Version of the Bible and its Influence. London, Putnam. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Dembleby, J. M., The Key to the Brontë Works. Showing the method of their Construction. London, W. Scott. 6*s.*

Dimmet, E., Les soeurs Bronté. (Les grands écrivains étrangers.) Paris, Bloud et Cie. 2 fr. 50.

Dryden, J., Poems. Oxford Edition. London, Frowde. 2*s.*

Eimer, M., Die persönlichen Beziehungen zwischen Byron und den Shelleys. Eine kritische Studie. (Anglistische Forschungen, xxxii.) Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 20.

Fitzgerald, S. J. A., Dickens and the Drama. London, Chapman and Hall. 5*s.* net.

Garlanda, F., Guglielmo Shakespeare: il poeta e l' uomo. Nuova ediz. Rome, Soc. editr. Laziale. 6 L.

Intze, O., Nicholas Rowe. Heidelberg, K. Groos. 20 M.

Knortz, K., Walt Whitman und seine Nachahmer. Leipzig, W. Heichen. 1 M. 20.

Lauvrière, É., Repetition and parallelism in Tennyson. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Legouis, É., Chaucer. (Les grands écrivains étrangers.) Paris, Bloud et Cie. 2 fr. 50.

Moore, T., Poetical Works. Oxford Edition. London, Frowde. 2*s.*

Richter, L., Swinburne's Verhältnis zu Frankreich und Italien. (Münchener Beiträge zur roman. und engl. Phil., li.) Leipzig, Deichert. 3 M.

Ristine, F. H., English Tragi-comedy: its Origin and History. London Macmillan. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Rotzoll, E., Die Deminutivbildungen im Neuenglischen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Dialekte. (Anglistische Forschungen, xxxi.) Heidelberg, Winter. 8 M. 60.

Schelling, F. E., English Literature during the Lifetime of Shakespeare. London, G. Bell. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Schendel, A. van, Shakespeare. Amsterdam, W. Versluys. 1 fl. 90.

Schulze, K., Die Satiren Hall's, ihre Abhängigkeit von den altrömischen Satirikern und ihre Realbeziehungen auf die Shakespeare-Zeit. (Palaestra, cvi.) 8 M.

Spenser, E., Minor Poems. Edited with critical introduction and appendices by E. de Sélincourt. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Swift, J., Prosaschriften. Herausg. von F. P. Greve. ii.—iv. Band. Berlin, E. Reiss. Each 4 M.

Warrack, A., A Scots Dialect Dictionary: comprising the words in use from the latter part of the 17th century to the present day. London, Chambers. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General.*

Friedli, E., Bärndütsch als Spiegel bernischen Volkstums. iii. Guggisberg. Bern, A. Francke. 12 fr. 50.

Jenny, E., und V. Rossel, Geschichte der schweizerischen Literatur. 2 Bände. Bern, A. Francke. 10 fr.

Kluge, F., Seemannssprache. Wortgeschichtliches Handbuch deutscher Schifferausdrücke älterer und neuerer Zeit. 5. (Schluss-)Lieferung. Halle, Buchh. des Waisenhauses. 7 M. (Complete work, 30 M.)

Kürsten, O., und O. Bremer, Lautlehre der Mundart von Buttelstedt bei Weimar. (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken deutscher Mundarten, ix.) Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel. 8 M. 50.

Seiler, F., Die Entwicklung der deutschen Kultur im Spiegel des deutschen Lehnworts. iii. Das Lehnwort der neueren Zeit. 1 Abschnitt. Halle, Buchh. des Waisenhauses. 6 M.

Weigand, F. L. K., Deutsches Wörterbuch. 5 Aufl. 11 und 12 Lieferung. Giessen, A. Töpelmann. Each 1 M. 60.

Werle, G., Die ältesten germanischen Personennamen. (Beiheft der Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung, xii.) Strassburg, Trübner. 2 M. 75.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German, Old Saxon.*

Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, herausg. von der königl. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Berlin, Weidmann. xi. Taulers Predigten, aus der Engelberger und Freiburger Handschrift sowie aus Schmidts Abschriften der ehemaligen Strassburger Handschriften herausg. von F. Vetter. 18 M. xxi. Dichtungen des deutschen Ordens. iv. Die mitteldeutsche poetische Paraphrase des Buches Hiob aus der Handschrift des kgl. Staatsarchivs zu Königsberg herausg. von T. E. Karsten. 11 M. 60.

Gröger, O., Die althochdeutsche und altsächsische Kompositionsfuge mit Verzeichnis der althochdeutschen und altsächsischen Komposita. (Abhandlungen herausg. von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache in Zürich, xi.) Zürich, Zürcher und Furrer. 12 fr. 50.

Reissmann, G., Tito's von Culm Gedicht von Siben Ingesigeln. (Palaestra, xcix.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 6 M.

Spanier, M., 'Nemt, frouwe, disen Kranz.' Fünfzehn Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide. Eine Einführung. Hamburg, Jannsen. 1 M. 25.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Basch, V., Poétique de Schiller. Essai d'esthétique littéraire. 2me édit. Paris, Alcan. 7 fr. 50.

Bastier, P., L'ésotérisme de Hebbel. Paris, E. Larose. 2 fr.

Benöhr, F., Die politische Dichtung aus und für Schleswig-Holstein in den Jahren 1840–64. Schleswig, Ibbeken. 2 M.

Biese, A., Deutsche Literaturgeschichte. iii. Band. Munich, C. H. Beck. 5 M. 50.

Brentano, C., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von C. Schüddekopf. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

Diederich, B., Hamburger Poeten. Charakterbilder aus der Literatur unserer Zeit. (Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, lxxi.) Leipzig, Verlag für Literatur, Kunst und Musik. 3 M.

Freytag, G., Gesammelte Werke. 3. Aufl. 18 Bände. Leipzig, S. Hirzel. Each vol. 3 or 4 M.

Fürst, R., Heines Leben, Werke und Briefe. (H. Heines Sämtliche Werke, x.) Leipzig, Tempel-Verlag. 3 M.

Glöel, H., Goethes Wetzlarer Zeit. Bilder aus der Reichskammergerichts- und Wertherstadt. Berlin, Mittler. 5 M.

Goedeke, K., Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. 2te Aufl. IX. Band. Dresden, Ehlermann. 14 M. 80.

Goethe, J. W. von, Autobiographische Schriften. III. Bd. (Grossherzog Wilhelm Ernst Ausgabe.) Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 5 M. 50.

Goethe, J. W. von, Kunstschriften. I. Band. (Grossherzog Wilhelm Ernst Ausgabe.) Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 6 M.

Goethe und seine Freunde im Briefwechsel. Herausg. von R. M. Meyer. III. Band. Berlin, Bondi. 6 M.

Grabbe, C. D., Werke. Herausg. von A. Franz und P. Zaunert. 3 Bände. Leipzig, Bibliogr. Institut. 6 M.

Grillparzer, F., Werke. Im Auftrage der Reichshaupt- und Residenzstadt Wien herausg. von A. Sauer. I. Band. Vienna, Gerlach und Wiedling.

Grimm, J. und W., Briefe an Paul Wigand, veröffentlicht und erläutert von E. Stengel. III. Band. Marburg, N. G. Ewert. 6 M.

Groth, K., Briefe an seine Braut Doris Finke. Herausg. von H. Krumm. Brunswick, Westermann. 4 M.

Häusle, H., Eichendorffs Puppenspiel, 'Das Incognito.' Eine politisch-literarische Satire. (Deutsche Quellen und Studien, VI.) Regensburg, Habbel. 3 M.

Heine, H., Neue Briefe und Aufsätze. Herausg. von M. von Heine-Geldern und G. Karpeles. Berlin, Curtius. 7 M. 50.

Hermann, W., Theodor Storms Lyrik. (Probefahrten, XVII.) Leipzig, Voigtländer. 5 M. 50.

Jahresberichte für neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte. XIX. und XX. Band. I. Bibliographie. Berlin, B. Behr. 18 M.

Klewitz, J., Die Natur in Günthers Lyrik. Jena, Passage-Buchh. 2 M. 50.

Lempicki, S. von, Immermanns Weltanschauung. Berlin, B. Behr. 3 M. 50.

Lenz, J. M. R., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von F. Blei. IV. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 7 M. 50.

Lieder, Acht, aus der Reformationszeit. Festgabe der Gesellschaft für deutsche Literatur für R. von Liliencron. Berlin, B. Behr. 10 M.

Platen, A. von, Briefwechsel. Herausg. von L. von Scheffler und P. Bornstein. I. Band. Munich, G. Müller. 7 M. 50.

Richter, W., Liebeskampf 1630 und Schaubühne 1670. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Theatergeschichte des 17. Jahrh. (Palaestra, LXXVIII.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 12 M.

Rost, J. C., Das Vorspiel. Ein episches Gedicht (1742). Herausg. von F. Ullrich. (Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrh. CXLII.) Berlin, B. Behr. 1 M. 50.

Schiller, J. F. von, Sämtliche Werke. II. IV. und V. Band. Leipzig, Tempel-Verlag. Each 3 M.

Schiller, J. F. von, Gespräche. Berichte seiner Zeitgenossen über ihn. Herausg. von J. Petersen. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 3 M.

Schlösser, R., August Graf von Platen. Ein Bild seines geistigen Entwicklungsganges und seines dichterischen Schaffens. I. Band. Munich, R. Piper 14 M.

Schmidt, E., Reden zur Literatur- und Universitätsgeschichte Berlin Weidmann. 2 M. 40.

Speyer, M., F. W. Weber und die Romantik. (Deutsche Quellen und Studien, II.) Regensburg, Habbel. 9 M.

Spiero, H., Deutsche Geister. Studien und Essays zur Literatur der Gegenwart. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 5 M.

Sternberg, K., Gerhart Hauptmann. Der Entwicklungsgang seiner Dichtung. Berlin, W. Borngräber. 4 M.

Stifter, A., Sämtliche Werke. III. Band. (Bibliothek deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen, XXII.) Prague, J. G. Calve. 6 Kr.

Traumann, E., Goethe, der Strassburger Student. Leipzig, Klinkhardt und Biermann. 5 M. 50.

Wackenroder, W. H., Werke und Briefe. Herausg. von F. von der Leyen. 2 Bände. Jena, E. Diederichs. 6 M.

Wagner, A. M., Das Drama F. Hebbels. Eine Stilbetrachtung zur Kenntnis des Dichters und seiner Kunst. (Beiträge zur Ästhetik, XIII.) Hamburg, L. Voss. 17 M.

Wegener, C. H., H. Assmann, Freiherr von Abschatz. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im 17. Jahrh. (Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, XXXVIII.) Berlin, A. Duncker. 3 M.

Weigle, J., E. Geibels Jugendlyrik. Marburg, N. G. Elwert. 2 M.

Wieland, C. M., Gesammelte Schriften. Herausg. von der deutschen Kommission der königl. preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften. I. Abt., iii. Poetische Jugendwerke. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 M.